

**DRAFT MINUTES OF ENHANCEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING of the
NATURAL AREA RESERVES SYSTEM COMMISSION (NARSC) May 4, 2009,
Honolulu.**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Dr. James Jacobi
Dr. R. Flint Hughes
Mr. Trae Menard
Mr. Scott Derrickson, for Director, Office of Planning
Dr. Scott Rowland

STAFF:

Mr. Randy Kennedy, DOFAW
Ms. Betsy Gagné, DOFAW
Ms. Emma Yuen, DOFAW
Ms. Lisa Ferentinos, DOFAW
Mr. Michael Constantinides, DOFAW
Mr. Bill Evanson, DOFAW

ITEM 1. Emma Yuen, as Enhancement Coordinator, called the meeting together at 8:45 a.m., with handouts of the Conservation Management Strategy, and minutes from the individual island branch Biologically Important Areas meetings. Staff Yuen then gave a summary of progress of the Enhancement Initiative: The purpose was both to fulfill the NARS Commission's statutory duty to recommend NARS, but also advise on conservation in general to the department. Using criteria selected from meetings of the NARS Commission and locations suggested by Commissioners, staff, and experts, around 25 areas were prioritized as Biologically Important Areas. Following that, branch meetings discussed management and political feasibility, as well as biological considerations for each area. Staff Yuen gave an overview of the agenda and goals of the meeting: This was give an overview of conservation mechanisms and recommendations from the branch and also then make recommendations to the NARS Commission about an appropriate vehicle to implement the Conservation Management Strategy for each of the areas.

ITEM 2. Member Jacobi stated that the NARS Commission has a 2-fold mandate, both advising on the geographic area for NARS but also a broader application of conservation of land for biological value. He said he is not sure whether the NARS Commission is willing to make recommendations for designations other than NARS, since he is unclear what the other designations' conservation mandates are. He envisioned that all these other designations should have the same conservation definition and activities. Staff Kennedy added that it was the intent of Michael Buck to have a unified conservation program, which is why Staff Kennedy is the Native Ecosystems program manager, which has the jurisdiction of all the native ecosystems – whether in wildlife, forest reserves, etc. Staff Constantinides said that GMAs are also a land designation in DOFAW, but they are not meant to overlap with other designations, although in some cases they do. Member Jacobi asked what is the placement of the “P” subzone? Was this a conservation

designation or a set of rules, since it does not mandate active management or having a management plan.

Member Jacobi said that the *Management Guidelines have the potential to be the overall umbrella to determine conservation areas, and that the NARS Commission should help facilitate it. Staff Constantinides said that these guidelines were under redevelopment, and there has not been much organizational acceptance of them within DOFAW as the overarching guide. However, personally, he thought that they should be heading that way, but for the time being we are off from that point. Member Jacobi said that for now, the Enhancement work was the game in town moving forward, and that he hopes that the Management Guidelines will move forward, but he understands Staff Cannarella is busy for the next two years with the SWARS.*

Staff Evanson said that this process has been the best communication within the branch that he has seen in all his many years of working for DOFAW, and has helped the branch's communication skills. He said it was helpful to have Commissioners around in the meeting, and that getting the branch together for Management Guidelines was useful.

Member Derrickson stated that one large threat gaining momentum was biofuels, especially with politicians, who in some cases were willing to exempt regulatory checks on procurement, environmental review, statutory relief, etc. That is why Staff Imoto was interested in getting unencumbered lands under some sort of designation. We need to be careful of State lands adjacent to private lands for invasives spreading. Staff Constantinides said that a way to mitigate would be getting certain plants banned by DOA through the Weed Risk Assessments. This is an opportunity for NARSC to influence the DLNR.

There was a discussion of ceded lands and where some areas could be moved to OHA ownership. This could be an opportunity, if there is a MOU to manage the area. Staff Constantinides explained that in Wao Kele O Puna, there was a DLNR manager and an OHA manager, so that the 2 managers could work together for 10 years, and then OHA manages on their own. OHA could provide funding, but their funding stream is variable, and they have no taxing authority.

Staff Constantinides said that there are many land acquisition programs funded through DOFAW, and there is a concerted effort that has been successful.

Staff Yuen gave a powerpoint presentation on the different Conservation Mechanisms, based an initial list of DLNR land designations, and the Management Intent Status of the Hawaii Gap Analysis. This "management intent" was meant to measure stewardship for the different types of Hawaii's landcover, and had 4 classes. Status 1 and 2 were measures of conservation intent. Staff Constantinides asked why there were not Forest Reserves in Management Intent Status 1 or 2. Staff Yuen mentioned there were two – the Hana and Koolau Forest Reserves on Maui, which had management by EMWP at the time HI-GAP was done. Member Jacobi said that we should not place too much weight

on these management intent status, as he was unsure or couldn't remember why certain areas were placed in different statuses and he was part of the HI GAP analysis team.

Staff Yuen continued to give an overview of Wildlife Sanctuaries and Forest Reserves statutes and rules, as well as information on State Parks, Wilderness Preserves, Marine Life Conservation Districts, the Forest Stewardship Program, the Natural Area Partnership Program, and other methods for funding private land acquisition and management. Staff Evanson corrected the DOFAW organizational chart presented, saying that it is different for each island, and jurisdiction is not solely for each manager for their land designation, but that it is shared. Also Forestry works on the UPW and baseyard operations. Staff Kennedy said that on Oahu and Kauai, the NARS managers were also in charge of native ecosystems similar to his jurisdiction, and for instance were historically in charge of managing the Alakai Wilderness Preserve. Staff Kyono had asked him a few years ago to make a management plan for the Alakai, and recently Forestry was writing a management plan.

Member Jacobi made the point that there was a gradient of the different designations as far as conservation mandate, such as GMAs. Wildlife Sanctuaries, NARS, and Wilderness Preserves were mainly for conservation, while Forest Reserves were multi-use with conservation, and GMAs were for hunting, but many had to deal with endangered species. Wilderness Preserves were similar to NARS, and plant sanctuaries as well, although they have evolved to be something smaller. MLCDs could have a NAR designation with DAR operating, since it makes sense for DAR to be able to address issues above the high wash of the waves. The subcommittee can best talk about Forest Reserves in this meeting because Staff Constantinides was attending. However, they can also understand the concept of other designations too.

Member Jacobi asked Staff Constantinides about the multiple mandates of Forestry, and how they are separated in each Reserve, and if there is a map. Staff Constantinides said that the Management Guidelines could help with differentiating the values and uses of different parts of the Forest Reserves. There is flexibility, as this does not require an EA. He gave a history about how there used to be a survey forester position that now the Legislature is abolishing, although we have much better information about the status of the forests now. Also, he gave some history on the management of forestry, and how there was less focus on developing the timber resources and more on native ecosystems, and the days of bulldozing native forests for timber plantations were over. However, some of the remaining stands of timber forestry could be used to make money, and there is also the possibility of salvaging Koa in Keanakolu area, but no other known plans of harvesting any native trees. There also is the possibility of planting Koa, and this is something that the Kona Hema Preserve of TNC was looking into. This could help reduce invasive species. Staff Evanson asked if there has been any large timber harvesting in any Forest Reserve in the last 20 years, and Staff Constantinides said no.

Member Menard mentioned that they had used the Management Guidelines for the template for the KWA management plan. Staff Evanson said that the NARS rules are non-consumptive and other designations do not have the NARS Commission. The

Commission helps with politicized things, such as Ahihi Kinau. A similar committee that could help with these guidelines would be revisiting the animal advisory committees, which are Governor-appointed. The only active one is the KALWAC.

State parks has an overlap with conservation management, but do not separate areas much, and has little resource management capacity currently. In Kauai, have relied on KRCP non profit to help manage resources. Staff Evanson said that the Kanaio coastline was recommended for a state park, not a national park. Makena park has no development and is for wilderness. He sees that the whole coastline could be a state park. There is no wilderness designation for state parks, but each management plan has some areas for wilderness, where certain facilities will not be developed.

For the management of private lands, there always is a MOU or MOA, as they are trying to get for the part of Ulupalakua Ranch that was fenced by Kanaio NAR. There also is the Watershed Partnerships, which are responsible for a majority of the active management, but the MOUs are not dedicated, and the most loose, and encompass the most conservation management areas. The HI GAP analysis struggled to categorize them. They are more dissolvable, like jello if too much water is added. How can we make them more secure? Member Menard said that their activities need a CDUP, which increases regulatory oversight of inconsistent activities. However, if you require a landowner in a WP to do certain activities, it will scare them away. The Wainiha Preserve has a 10 year management agreement. It is more desirable to invest resources in public rather than private land in the sense that there is more permanence and dedicated, and not going away. We should be careful not to be complacent in WPs, need to think of other ways to secure areas. However, there needs to be a 10 year agreement to get federal funding.

Kau Biologically Important Area

Staff Yuen gave a powerpoint presentation on the Kau area, as well as the Waihaka NAR proposal that TNC had done a botanical survey for. Member Hughes summarized the branch meeting as needing more information about the high value habitat for forest birds and get that info to Staff Bergfeld and Staff Ferentinos. Staff Bergfeld was willing to do additional management. However, the Waihaka proposal was not discussed in much depth. The Biologically Important Area identified was montane wet, and lowland wet, yet the Waihaka NAR proposal was distinct and had geological features. Staff Yuen mentioned that the branch did not think the ecosystems were not represented – and that similar ecosystems existed in Puu Makaala. The situation was that there is relatively few weeds but high pig disturbance in Kau FR.

After the watershed planner left, Staff Ferentinos was recommended to help put the plan together. Staff Fretz was asked to put together proposal for general, large management units. In July, there is a scheduled meeting to re-do the map and get info about the Alala and access, especially in the bottom of the Forest Reserve. There is a situation where most of the access is at the makai parts, but some at the North portion, as well as a new ATV trail almost to the top. Additionally, there is interest in using Lorenzo road at the south boundary for public access, but it seems the new fence with the National Park will

not allow for that. Currently, access is not allowed there anyway. There is the desire to increase hunting access in lower area, which may reduce pressure to provide access to other areas. Member Jacobi said that would not work, there is always pressure, and that it is undesirable to allow public access which spreads weeds and ants. Staff Ferentinos said they are trying to move both issues forward.

Member Jacobi mentioned the *Morella* problem, but that other weeds were not so bad, and that it is a unique ecosystem with a rainforest in a rain shadow – sort of like Kohala. There are low elevation populations of Creeper and Iiwi. There are significant differences between this area and Puu Makaala. It is currently unguarded. Member Hughes said that fencing would be the bottom line for effective conservation. Staff Ferentinos explained that there is an analysis of where the best reintroduction site for Alala is, and how they are more interested in areas with access, and where two sides of a fence area already going to be there from the NP. She suggested that the NARS Commission comment and look for the General Management Plan from the park, which they have been scoping. However, it may not be desirable to put the Alala in the most accessible place.

Staff Kennedy said that there is a Wildlife Sanctuary idea. Member Jacobi said that the area should not only be for the birds. This area was highlighted in the Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy. Perhaps there should be a corridor for conservation units for areas that do not have access or hunter issues. The wildlife program needs to adopt new concepts for animal management – there is no evidence of needing a “reservoir” of pigs to provide animals for a hunting unit, or that there is a need for migration. In actuality, the high, wet, and cold areas in the forest are the least suitable for pigs, as there is the highest infant mortality there. Member Menard mentioned a project to collar pigs in Kauai. Staff Evanson recalled getting the buy-off from hunter groups for a 2500-acre GMA in Kahakuloa makai where pigs would be abundant, in order to fence mauka areas. People often believe what meets their needs.

There was a question about Koa harvest in Kau, Staff Constantinides said only salvage was happening in Keanakolu, not anything in Kau.

Member Jacobi said he liked where the discussion of Kau is going. We should go to the Commission for opportunities of areas with NAR quality, and work with DOFAW staff and NPS on options. This area should not be put on the fast track for a NAR proposal. However, could support the whole area as a NAR as far as size matters.

Staff Yuen said that it was important to move on and get to other areas that have moving parts happening, such as forest reserve management plans, acquisition potential, etc. Some of those were Koaie, and Kuia North, which are part of the Na Pali Kona Forest Reserve, as well as the Molokai Forest Reserve, and the Kahikinui Forest Reserve, which had a lot of attention for fencing.

Staff Constantinides mentioned that one possibility was 100 acres above Kipahoe NAR that DOFAW was interested for access. There was an issue over logging in State

land, which soon should be resolved by a Federal judge. This could be similar to Tract 22, and should be checked out if judge's decision is favorable to the State.

Staff Kennedy said that the NARS process was not complete, and it was flawed in the 1980s, and did not have enough capacity. It is good to revisit this now.

Waiea also is up for discussion, and is in good shape, and the Honokua area which is owned by McCandless. However, it is important to determine who has management responsibility, especially when talking about the Hamakua parcel. Commissioner Hughes started summarizing the rest of the branch meeting – how the NAR proposal boundaries should be redrawn, etc. But Staff Yuen asked that each areas should be brought up individually, rather than a general overview.

Na Kula

Staff Yuen gave a powerpoint presentation about the Biologically Important Area and the NAR proposal, as well as current fences and plans for more fencing. Also, there have been at least three branch meetings specifically addressing this NAR proposal. The Dryland Forest Working Group has been very interested in this area, and much money has been put towards this area. There is interest in DOFAW for recreational/hunting uses, although there is no current public access. Staff Ferentinos said that the LHWRP had an EA to have the fence slightly changed at the bottom of the DHHL proposed fence. Staff Yuen mentioned that the NAR proposal was meant to get on-island presence for implementing plans and building the fence with logistical support. Also, this was not a represented ecosystem in the NARS. The LHWRP had expressed support of the NAR proposal, and urgency of fencing the area as it continues to degrade. In the branch discussion, there was also talk of not splitting the area between NAR and Forest Reserve.

Staff Evanson said that there is disagreement about this proposal within DOFAW and recalls that the Forestry section was firmly against the proposal. Staff Kennedy, Yuen, and Member Jacobi said that they did not recall the meeting that way. Also, the upper area would be the most desirable for hunting, since it was where historically hunting occurred before DHHL cut off access. There may be a possibility to have the lease modified below the southeast corner of the Forest Reserve to allow access and even increase the area of the Forest Reserve.

Staff Evanson said that DOFAW is holding out hope that there will be access problems solved, and wants to meet once more as a district to try their hardest to come together for a recommendation. He worried it would appear that the proposal would seem like it was rammed down their throats. He recounted how after the branch meeting, Staff Yuen had asked if the NAR proposal may be ready to move forward, and he said he asked Forestry and Wildlife staff, who thought that it was not how they agreed in the meeting.

Commissioner Rowland said it was going to get that chance for discussion in the 90 day DOFAW recommendation period, and this could solve that need. Staff Constantinides said that there is serious controversy about this proposal among the branch, and that

should be discussed. Staff Yuen said that there are two options – either the Subcommittee can decide to recommend the proposal be presented at the next NARS Commission meeting, where the Commission will then decide whether to send it to the formal review process, or schedule another informal internal DOFAW Maui meeting. Member Jacobi said that there is a third option, it could be informally discussed within DOFAW, and then discussed in a meeting of the NARS Commission, especially with the hunter representative there. Staff Yuen said that it does not make sense for the entire Commission to weigh in on anything that is not a specific proposal – getting their general comments on the area would not be a productive step. It is precisely the role of the Subcommittee to go deep into the issues of the area, and only bring in the whole Commission when there is a specific recommendation. Otherwise, they would just bounce the issue back to the subcommittee, which has been done in the past.

While the Commission does not want to back pedal when areas are controversial, it may be good to give it another shot to be discussed with DOFAW, to discuss management planning. Staff Kennedy mentioned there have been quite a few meetings about this, and have been working on preserving this area and funding management for 10 years. Staff Yuen mentioned how one was even convened where no one showed up, and how she asked the Maui branch whether there were additional things to add in the minutes of the last BIA meeting, and did not get any response. Staff Evanson brought up how they have had a quick turnaround with their discussion for Ilio Point, so doesn't think the 90 days is sufficient. Staff Yuen said that was a miscommunication, and would fix that. Member Menard said it should not be a venting session, specific recommendations should come for management. Some topics would be what existing management units are in the Forest Reserve, who has the capacity to manage these, and whether area be split. Staff decided to recommend the proposal to the NARS Commission the meeting after the May 26, 2009 meeting to allow DOFAW to have time to have this meeting.

Blue Hole/ Wailua

Staff Yuen gave a presentation about this area, and how there are rare plant communities and how a proposal had been written about this because there was no lowland wet forest in a NAR in Kauai. The proposal was forwarded to the Kauai district, which responded that there was no need to designate a NAR but that they should recognize the important plant communities. Staff Gagne said it was part of the central caldera of Kauai. There was not much pig damage in the very back due to talus substrate, but further mauka outside the amphitheater are many pigs and much hunter access. Member Menard said it was one of the more popular hunting areas for people who did not want to drive to the west side. The biggest management concern are the weeds. Member Rowland said that if they are interested in the “valuable” plant populations, why not just include a much smaller area for a NAR? Staff Evanson mentioned the NARS standard, and how if there are weeds, perhaps it does not constitute a NAR, if the justification is rare plant species. The green sphinx moth was found there.

Member Rowland suggested that the Wilderness Preserve designation be extended from the Alakai. Staff Constantinides pointed out the administrative cost of that, and

questioned what would change on the ground. If there isn't going to be change, then it is not worth the administrative process. The cost of adding a NAR is around \$50,000 which is a disagreement he has with Staff Kennedy, who thinks it costs around \$2,000. Staff Constantinides said that the meeting today probably cost around \$3,000. Additionally, it seemed like the area of native ecosystem was less than 1000 acres. An objective for the NAR designation would be to make this area a gold standard, as a valuable example of an ecosystem and represent the lowland wet forest, geological features, and biodiversity. Staff Constantinides mentioned that Wainiha was 4000 acres of lowland wet forest, and could be a NAPP possibility. How could the NAR designation be a vehicle for conservation, and what are the costs and benefits of a NAR? Member Menard said that the KWA distinguished that area for its high biodiversity, and that the ATF is the biggest concern. They need to do whatever it takes to prevent weeds from plateau. The weed line is very obvious, and we know where the wall of weeds is heading. It does not have the best context. Should collect rare materials for outplanting. Managers could spend a million dollars pushing back the weed line in the pali lowland wet areas from Hanalei to Wailua. This could be more of a buffer area for the Alakai. But is that where you want to focus the money for management? There will not be much difference if it is a NAR or a Forest Reserve, although it is harder to get an area out of a NAR.

How could a Forest Reserve be designated for the similar attributes of a NAR? Perhaps Management Guidelines, or a strategic plan for DOFAW? Staff Gagne said that the Forest Reserve rules are actually better than the NAR rules. How does this all fit in with the weeds that are so costly to control? And climate change is even more depressing.

Member Jacobi mentioned how this discussion was worrisome because last year there was the Hono O Na Pali Extension, the Kalunanui, Poamoho which is just getting their feet wet, and not so many NAR proposals. So what is the mission of this subcommittee? Is it worth his time? The more talk, the more degradation. We are stalled. How can we find these conservation vehicles? Staff Constantinides added that without funding, it is very difficult, and the fact that they are funded at the current level shows the values and ways society allocates its resources. He asked why we are going through these exercises when we could be doing on-the-ground work. For instance, the National Parks took land out of the National Forests, but at what scale are people satisfied?

Staff Kennedy said that there are many examples where NAR designated would help with the ability to "do stuff" such as in Maui or in the Alakai, where some animal control permits were held captive because of being a multi-use Forest Reserve. They did not have the authority to snare, which would have been quicker in a NAR. People know what a NAR designation is for. For instance, in Kahikinui, Bob Hobdy proposed the area and it is still not protected.

Member Menard said it was good that Staff Constantinides was there at the meeting, and whether there was a way to make the Forest Reserves like a NAR with ability to control animals, no bag limit, etc. This is a major problem in the Alakai.

Staff Yuen said the only way to institutionalize this conservation focus in the Forest Reserves would be through the management plans. She is disappointed with the Na Pali Kona Management plan because from early on, it was clear that the area was a Biologically Important Area, and specific changes were suggested, but they were not adopted. There are no plans for large scale fences in the Management objectives section, or budget for these fences. She said that Staff Constantinides mentioned funding as a problem, but there wasn't even a request for funding these fences in the budget. It is clear that those fences would be the most important management activity, especially since watershed values were ranked the highest in the plan. What besides the management plan could institutionalize these types of conservation activities we are talking about?

Staff Constantinides said that the Management Guidelines could, if they are adopted by the agency. Member Jacobi said he likes that it is being done like this – where we are going to use the best information, find important areas, use the mandates of the Commission, and not back off. They should draw lines on maps and be clear on what guidelines for areas, of the three main mandates of the Forest Reserves. While there is some overlap between these, for others there is not. DLNR needs one vehicle for function across the board. Staff Kennedy said that that is what Michael Buck tried to do with making the Native Ecosystem section, but does not want to say that the other programs cannot work on the native ecosystems – everyone wants to be part of some conservation work. The Commission is there to support the native ecosystem activities, and has the breadth to make recommendations for all these areas. But they are stovepiped.

Member Rowland asked whether if all these areas turned into NARS, whether Member Jacobi thought they would be finished, or if that would be enough. Member Jacobi said he thought it wouldn't be enough – very large areas need to be in some conservation designation for Hawaii's native ecosystems to survive, although he doesn't think that all these areas should be NARS. Member Rowland said that we need to be practical, and focus their efforts with a few. Member Jacobi said that they need to focus on the high priorities. While NARS are not sacred to him, right now they are the best show in town. We are not trying to have more NAR-quality protection of areas – actions not designations.

Member Rowland asked about the different types of Forest Reserves. Staff Constantinides said there are no specific boundaries besides restricted watersheds, and those in Watershed Partnerships. Blue hole is not restricted.

Staff Yuen again called attention to the management plans, and how that is a way to influence management practices. Member Jacobi said that we must concentrate on BIAs and need to bring these areas to the NARS Commission not as NARS but as BIAs. Staff Yuen said that they are stalled on Blue Hole, and that they should move on.

Staff Constantinides said that the NARS Commission should look at the threats for areas, as the major impetus for projects, such as acquisition, instead of moving shells around in DOFAW. Instead, look at the threat of land development, and how it would help to move these areas under DOFAW.

Koaie

Member Menard asked to talk about Koaie, which has the Forest Reserve Management Plan, and the KWA management plan, with multiple entities focusing their efforts on it. This is a high priority for conservation management with the biggest bang for the buck. This is where we should put our money for the montane wet forest, which is unrepresented. It is better to do things here than at Blue Hole. There also is the very important mesic areas in the canyon. There have been a lot of work to take out outlying ginger patches and strawberry guava. It is the most defensible as far as the condition and context.

Staff Kennedy said that Staff Kyono had asked their section to do a management plan for the area, but now had a forest reserve plan. How does the KWA plan and the Forest Reserve plan go together? Staff Constantinides said the Forest Reserve plan was free-standing. Member Derrickson asked how they inform each other? Staff Yuen said that the KWA plan was more specific about maps where high priority weed control or ungulate control areas were, where the Forest Reserve plan is more vague as far as locations. That plan rates the values for the area, and in the management objectives section, there is no plan or budget for large scale fences. She said her comments were not addressed in the plan. Staff Constantinides said that the plan represents the vision of the Kauai branch staff and will not fully satisfy someone who has a passion for native ecosystems. Other areas will be the same. There will be a disparity.

Staff Constantinides said that they will be meeting with Member Menard as the coordinator of the Watershed Alliance to get input on plan. Member Menard said to be careful because as the coordinator, he cannot speak for the partners.

Perhaps in the less accessible areas they can do this management, where there may be less pushback from hunters. This is what is driving the branch on-the-ground. Staff Kennedy said that the current DOFAW Administrator likes conservation, but what if there is a different philosophy in the future? Are there a reasonable amount of checks and balances in the system? Constantinides said that if there was a new DOFAW Administrator in the future, there are these checks. Staff Kennedy mentioned that in Kuia NAR, there is the same hunting rules as a GMA for twenty years, but perhaps it will change this year. Staff Evanson said it was fundamental to focus on the conservation strategy.

Member Menard said to propose Koaie as BIA that needs a higher level of management. The NARS Commission can give comments, as well as DOFAW. Staff Yuen reminded that they had proposed it as a BIA in the October 7, 2008 Subcommittee meeting with branch and program managers, as well as staff and other DLNR divisions, and outside experts. Then, the next step was to discuss with the branches about conservation vehicles, such as a NAR or a Wildlife Sanctuary, etc. Then at this meeting, they are supposed to propose one of those vehicles. Member Menard said it needs to be taken to the next level.

Member Rowland said that all they can do is propose a NAR. Staff Yuen said that they could look at any designation or vehicle, and ask her to move forward whatever designation they thought appropriate. Member Rowland said that it is not up to the NARS Commission to designate Wildlife Sanctuaries. Staff Yuen asked whether they were proposing this area to begin the NAR process? Staff Kennedy said that it would allow them to record the propositions of DOFAW. Member Jacobi said that NAR is a higher level. Member Rowland said that some may not agree with that, but should get feedback.

Bring the recommendation to the full Commission. Ask DOFAW to get on paper what kind of concurrence there is for this area. Staff Constantinides asked that the Commission does not overwhelm DOFAW with these requests. Be selective on how to move forward. Member Jacobi said they need to put a proposal together, but do not overwhelm DOFAW, nor sell short. And everyone should look at the Management Guidelines. Bring that to the full Commission as a request, and ask that Staff Cannarella and Conry be there at the meeting. This could allow us to see the big picture.

Staff Yuen mentioned that there were other areas that would be helpful to talk about – the areas of acquisition potential. These are the areas south of Waiea and Hamakua. In the future, if the NARS Commission could say that they are interested in these areas, it might help with acquiring. Staff Constantinides agreed.

Hamakua

Staff Yuen gave a powerpoint presentation about this area, which was suggested by Staff Constantinides. It is sometimes referred to as the Koa Timber land. There have been some conservation district violations as well as some concerns that the EIS does not have enough assurances or bonds, that the weed control portion will be completed if the operation is not profitable enough.

Staff Constantinides said that the threat potential is huge for the area because of the logging plans. They have been approaching the landowner for interest in acquisition or a conservation easement. This would be a multi-year acquisition. Member Menard asked if illegal logging would stop if it was State land.

Member Jacobi said that this area was biologically important, but not the highest priority. There is potential habitat for ao but not so much for uau. There is a big weed problem – waiawi and palm grass. It may be a nice piece to add to a NAR, and there is high hydrologic value but it isn't in Hilo's watershed. It is not in a Watershed Partnership, as there is no Mauna Kea WP yet. It would be good to check it out in the air. Higher priority would be around Tree Planting Road by Puu Huluhulu.

Waiea

Member Jacobi said that the Waiea was a higher priority, as it is more intact than the rest of the McCandless portion, as it is made up of an aa substrate. The Honokua tract has major threats such as *Shinus* and *Clidemia*. However, it doesn't have many of the worst weeds, such as blackberry, waiawi, etc. It is good potential habitat for ieie, and has

Cyanea marksii. Staff Evanson pointed out it was a buyer's market. Staff Kennedy said that the Legacy Lands funds may be spared in this Legislative session.

Summary

The bigger issues for recommending to the full Commission are the Management Guidelines with Staff Conry and Staff Cannarella. However, the SWARS is taking priority, not Management Guidelines. Staff Cannarella is booked for the next two years.

Also, advising the management plans from the Forestry section. However, we need to revise the NARS management plans too, and can't be too critical as the NARS need updating.

Member Jacobi said that the Commission should also comment on HAVO's General Management Plan, and should check out the Ungulate Management Strategy of the EIS.

A NAR proposal should be presented for the NARS Commission for Waiea and Koaie area, as well as the meeting afterwards will have the Na Kula proposal submitted. The Commission meeting will also make a recommendation to make a statement of support for an acquisition inquiry for Hamakua, and support acquisition for Honokua.

Member Derrickson said that the Kaluanui NAR proposal should also be forwarded to SHPD. The cultural assessment will be interesting because the area is sacred to Kamapuaa. Member Derrickson recounted the traditional story of Kamapuaa's escape from Olopana. Staff Yuen also asked whether the Tract 22 proposal should be forwarded to HAVO, and members agreed.

ITEM 3. Staff Yuen said that the next meeting date will be on May 26, 2009.

ITEM 4. Adjournment.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:00pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Emma Yuen', with a stylized, swirling flourish at the end.

Emma Yuen, NARS Enhancement Coordinator