

## **Forest Stewardship Advisory Committee Meeting**

Division of Forestry & Wildlife  
Kilauea Military Camp  
99-252 Crater Rim Drive  
Volcano, HI 96785  
September 18 and 19, 2015

**Present:** Nicholas Koch (Chair), Betsy Gagné (Ex-officio), Alvin Kyono, Michael Constantinides, Gregory Koob, Patrick Conant, Rich von Wellsheim, Koa Kaulukukui, J.B. Friday, Greg Hendrickson, Kip Dunbar, Jay Warner

**Staff:** Irene Sprecher, Malia Nanbara, Marissa Chee

**Guests:** Katie Friday, Alex Gerken, Pat Tummons, Elisabeth Green, Wade Lee, and Justin Lee

### **1. Call to Order:**

Meeting was called to order at 9:45 am by Chair Koch.

### **2. Welcome new members and guests**

### **3. Meeting Minutes – May 29, 2015:**

The FSAC reviewed the meeting minutes from the May 29, 2015 meeting and made the following corrections and comments:

- Page 2, “mizo raspberry” should be replaced with “mysore raspberry”.
- Page 2, “Hokukani” should be changed to “Hokukano”.
- Page 3, “sq. ft.” should be replaced with “board ft.”
- Page numbers need to be added.

**Motion to approve the May 29, 2015 FSAC meeting minutes as corrected. Moved by Member Gagné, seconded by Member Koob.**

**Approve: Koch, Friday, Gagné, Hendrickson, Koob, Conant, Dunbar, Constantinides;  
Oppose: none; Abstain: Kaulukukui and Wellsheim.**

**Motion passed.**

### **4. Rapid ‘Ōhi‘a Death:**

- Member J. Friday updated the committee about rapid ‘ōhi‘a death (ROD). Confirmed cases have been found on the borders of Hawai‘i Volcanoes National Park (HVNP), the Wailuku River, and in Puna. ROD has not been found on any other islands yet. The Hawai‘i Department of Agriculture (HDOA) is doing sample testing on some suspicious samples from HVNP and the Kona area. HDOA has imposed a quarantine on the movement of ‘ōhi‘a from the Big Island. The quarantine will expand to include soil in January 2016. They have found that ROD mainly moves in the xylem of ‘ōhi‘a. They have been observing 18 permanent plots and it appears there is almost 100% mortality.
- Member Constantinides added that NRCS sent out an advisor to their staff regarding information on ROD. After the DOA quarantine expires in 1 year, it will be reassessed. The Agricultural Diagnostic Service Center will have an exemption on their permit that will allow them to accept soil samples from the Big Island for analysis during the quarantine.

## **5. Native Hawaiian Law Training:**

- Staff Nanbara, Staff Sprecher, Member Dunbar, and Member Koob shared their thoughts on the training. Staff Nanbara said some of the topics covered at the training included the history of how land laws were created, the obligation to protect customary rights, water as a public trust, and discovering iwi kupuna during development. Member Dunbar said there a lot of grey areas and hoped things will be clarified in the future. Staff Sprecher said there was a lot of good discussion and encouraged the committee to attend. Member Koob said one take home message was that compliance upfront is better and cheaper than later after the fact. Legal primers and the agenda were made available to the committee.

## **6. Forest Stewardship Program (FSP) Project Proposals:**

### **6.2 Ola‘a Forest Farm, Puna District, Hawai‘i County:**

- Staff Nanbara introduced the proposal as a project located in Puna. It is a relatively intact native forest with some incipient weeds. The landowners are also interested in participating in the CREP program. They want to do two 5 acre CREP projects and do 12 acres of agroforestry in the understory. 22 acres would be limited to weed management.
- Member Conant suggested checking the district because it is listed as Ka‘u instead of Puna on the agenda.
- Guest Gerken clarified that the blue lines on the map were streams and that there are several intermittent streams on the property.
- Member Kyono asked why the map says there will be 22 acres in the FSP area, while the proposal says 47 acres. Staff Sprecher said the FSP area will include the entirety of the property. Guest Gerken added that the TMK layer is off so he needs to work on redrawing the area to fix the discrepancy.
- Member Conant said they probably meant to list strawberry guava, not the common guava on page 3. He also felt that the mulching cost was high. Member J. Friday recommended checking the number of acres that are going to be mulched. The proposal currently says 11 acres, but that is too high if it is only going to be done around each planting. Guest Gerken said they plan to get their mulch from the strawberry guava they remove.
- Member J. Friday and Member Kyono felt that 1,200 plants per acre seems high for a mostly intact native forest. Staff Sprecher said they are planning to remove dense areas of strawberry guava and replant.
- Staff Sprecher provided the quotes for the development of a management plan: \$2000, \$4700, and \$6800. They are hoping to write some of the management plan themselves.
- Member Constantinides commented that bulldozing the perimeter for fencing may bring weeds into the area, so they may want to consider less extensive methods. Member Conant agreed saying it is not necessary for a fence that short. The proposed planting list has some potential threatened and endangered species so they may want to look into other possibilities. Some are also not native to the Big Island. Member Constantinides said that forest stand improvement is the thinning of a desirable species and may not be necessary since they do not intend to do harvesting. Brush management would be more applicable.
- Member Koob felt that fertilizing every year was not necessary since the area is mostly intact. If they are planning to do work in the stream, it would require permitting. He was not sure how the special area practices section applied to the project. Staff Nanbara said she

informed the applicant that although they will not be given cost share for those practices, they could still include it in their management plan. Member Koob asked if there were wetlands on the property. Guest Gerken did not think so, but he has not seen the entire property.

- Chair Koch recused himself because Forest Solutions was one of the bidders.
- Member J. Friday said that taro may not do well at that elevation and rainfall. He said he would like to know what the percent of native forest cover is in project proposals. He also felt that \$8,000 per acre seemed high.
- Member Constantinides clarified that when you intend to remove some vegetation and replant, the practice should be site preparation. If you only intend to take out incipient weeds and passively managing the land, the practice would be brush management.

**Motion to approve the project proposal for the development of a Forest Stewardship management plan with 50% cost share support for the total cost of the management plan not to exceed \$2,500. Moved by Member Wellsheim, seconded by Member Constantinides.**

**Approve: Gagné, Kyono, Kaulukukui, Koob, Constantinides, Conant, Hendrickson, Dunbar, Wellsheim; Oppose: none; Abstain: Koch, J. Friday.**

## **7. Forest Stewardship Program (FSP) Management Plans:**

### **7.1 Duren Forest Stewardship Management Plan:**

- Staff Sprecher, reminded the committee that the project proposal was reviewed at the previous meeting. It is a 22 acre project on Hualalai that has a nice native canopy, is somewhat open, and has some invasive weeds creeping in.
- Member Koob said on page 3, 'io should be designated as endangered, not "near threatened". He also said because the plan mentions that many native insects, spiders, and snails have been observed on the property, there should be a list of those species. Staff Sprecher said that Steve Montgomery did not provide a list of insects. Member Koob pointed out that the caption for the picture on page 14 said it showed a dense forest. He felt that the forest in the picture did not look that dense.
- Member Conant said that a biocontrol moth could be used to control German ivy.
- According to the rainfall atlas, rainfall should be 30 inches per year, not 20. The atlas also says that the rainy season is from December through April, not September through January. He noted that there are several species of Pittorsporum, so they should make sure they plant the species they want. He asked why it is not possible to bring groups of people to property. Staff Sprecher said there are lava tube openings around the property which would be too big of a liability. Member J. Friday also said that he likes sharing weather data, but is not sure who wundergourd is. He suggested that they connect with NOAA, Tom Giambelluca, and the USGS water commission.
- Member Constantinides said some of the practice codes are incorrect. Fence and access control are not the same practice anymore. Fencing is 382. Tree/shrub site preparation is 490. He added that the proposed rate for weed control is higher than what NRCS funds.
- Member Dunbar felt that a 3 person crew should be able to plant more than 800 plants per year. He suggested they consider using Fusilade instead of Roundup since it will not affect woody plants. Spraying 2 hours before rain may not be enough time.

- Member J. Friday said they should think more about fire plan. Staff Sprecher said they intend to keep the road and trails open for access in case of fire.
- Chair Koch liked that Ceratocystis was mentioned. He did not think there were any legal pesticides for myoporom thrips, however Member Conant thought that Movento and Safari work and may be legal.

**Motion to approve the Duren Forest Stewardship Management Plan contingent on DOFAW working with the landowner to address the comments from the committee. Moved by Member Constantinides, seconded by Member Conant.**

**Approve: Gagné, Kyono, Kaulukukui, Koob, Constantinides, Conant, Hendrickson, Wellsheim; Oppose: Dunbar; Abstain: Koch, J. Friday.**

- Staff Sprecher said that the landowner is looking into participating in CREP because the lava tubes qualify. Some practices such as fencing and monitoring will not be covered by CREP, so they will be seeking funding from FSP for those. Member Constantinides suggested also including woody residue treatment since that is not covered by CREP.

**Motion to defer cost share support until seeing an updated budget with CREP funding incorporated. Moved by Member Wellsheim, seconded by Member Conant.**

**Approve: Gagné, Kyono, Kaulukukui, Koob, Constantinides, Conant, Hendrickson, Wellsheim, Dunbar, Koch; Oppose: none; Abstain: J. Friday.**

#### 7.2 Pace Demonstration Forest Management Plan:

- Staff Sprecher stated that the management plan was reviewed by the committee at the previous meeting, at which they asked that staff work with the land owner to incorporate their comments and resubmit the plan for review.

#### *Discussion:*

- Member Hendrickson said that the TMK on page 1 should be: (3) 7-9-001:032, 033, 036, and 037. The zoning designation should be Ag 20, not AG 80.
- Member Constantinides questioned why the fencing height was changed from 6 feet to 4 feet from the previous draft. The fence should be 6 feet because of the mouflon sheep in the area. He also felt that the planting density of 200-300 trees per acre in areas where scarification does not work is too low. A higher planting density will provide better form.
- Member Koob felt that some of the wording in the plan implies that the project will be focusing on forest ecosystem restoration with a variety of species; even though the main focus will be timber production. Staff Sprecher said that they are implying there will be benefits for wildlife species, mainly birds. Member Hendrickson also pointed out that this project will improve forest health and biodiversity given the current condition of the site.
- Member Conant wanted to see a planting list for the other 10% of species to be planted.
- Member J. Friday felt that the prices, growth rates, rotation age may be slightly optimistic in the economic analysis. Member Hendrickson commented that the logging cost of \$1.50 per board foot came from a pilot project that was conducted on logging costs in Hawai'i. The estimates may be high, but the objective of this demonstration project is to determine what the costs are and share that with other landowners.
- Chair Koch calculated the land expectation value to be approximately \$4,200/acre (at \$15/BdFt, \$1,605,924/380 acres=\$4226). It is rare to see expectation values over \$2,000.

- Guest K. Friday said that since the objective is to serve as a demonstration forest, DOFAW should approve the content of the kiosk since the bulk of outreach will be at the beginning. She also suggested handing out dynamic informational packages as the project progresses, instead of installing a kiosk. As more information is learned, the handouts can be updated.
- Member J. Friday felt that the economics is an essential part of plan, given that the net present value needs to be positive. Member Constantinides felt that the importance of the economic side of the project is debatable.
- Member J. Friday stated that according to the rainfall atlas, rainfall should be approximately 30 inches, not 13 to 20 inches. Guest Wade Lee, who owns the adjacent property, said his property gets about 27 inches.
- Member Kaulukukui felt that the plan is somewhat incomplete.
- Guest K. Friday wanted clarification if both organized tours of professionals and the public will only occur once a year, or if tours will be more often. Installing a kiosk would be appropriate if there will be a steady stream of visitors.
- Staff Sprecher clarified that the Forest Stewardship agreement is an encumbrance on the property, so if the property is sold and the landowner decides to not go forward with the contract, they are required to pay back funding that was provided for the project.

**Motion to approve the Pace Demonstration Forest Management Plan contingent on DOFAW working with the landowner to address the comments from the committee. Moved by Member Wellsheim, seconded by Member Constantinides.**

**Approve: Koch, Gagné, Koob, Constantinides, Wellsheim, Conant; Opposed: Dunbar, Kaulukukui, Kyono; Abstain: Hendrickson and J. Friday.**

**Motion passed.**

*Continued discussion:*

- Chair Koch felt that the planting cost is somewhat high.

**Motion to approve cost support as submitted with the caveat that a 6ft fence may incur a higher cost. Moved by Member Constantinides, seconded by Member Conant.**

**Approve: Koch, Gagné, Koob, Constantinides, Wellsheim, Conant; Opposed: Dunbar, Kaulukukui, Kyono; Abstain: Hendrickson and J. Friday.**

**Motion passed.**

### **7.3 Mana Gardens Forest Stewardship Management Plan:**

- Staff Sprecher stated that the management plan was reviewed by the committee at the previous meeting, at which they recommended it for approval. Based on discussions with the landowner and fairly substantive changes made to the management plan, staff recommended that the plan come back to the committee for review.
- Staff Nanbara said the plan is for a 34 acre project in Puna. The map has been updated. The first part of the implementation schedule will be targeting one acre of miconia. Descriptions of the different forest types in area are also included. Site prep and planting practices were included, but planting will need to be added to the implementation schedule.
- Chair Koch calculated the cost/acre to be approximately \$10,000/acre, which seems high for an area that is partly forested.

- Staff Nanbara said the landowner intends to go through EQIP, but they do not have an approved contract with NRCS yet.
- Member Constantinides was unclear on proposed project area. Guest Green clarified that within the 34 acre project site, approximately 10 acres will need site preparation. Member Constantinides said that the paragraph under brush control should be changed to tree and shrub site prep to show a progression of practices. He added that they should consider adding woody residue treatment if the intention is to chip or cut up any of the treated trees. Member Conant felt that would just unnecessarily increase the cost.
- Member Conant recommended using galvanized t-posts all the way around since it will last longer. Guest Green commented that EQIP would cover most of the fencing costs.
- Member Hendrickson was concerned that they may not get funding from NRCS for fencing. Member Constantinides said that they are more likely to get funding from NRCS if the proposal focuses heavily on wildlife habitat enhancement and protection.
- Member Koob added that in areas where bats are present, fences with barbed wire are allowed if you do a formal consultation with FWS. FWS can also go through a process to determine if there bats are in the area and if the area qualifies.

**Motion to approve the Mana Gardens Management Plan contingent on DOFAW working with the landowner to address the comments from the committee. Moved by Member Hendrickson, seconded by Member Koob.**

*Discussion:*

- Member Kaulukukui felt that the plan was incomplete and did not feel comfortable approving a plan that has inaccurate numbers

**Approve: Koch, Gagné, Koob, Constantinides, Wellsheim, Conant, Kyono, Hendrickson; Opposed: Dunbar, Kaulukukui; Abstain: Wellsheim and J. Friday.**

**Motion passed.**

**Motion to defer cost share support until NRCS determines their ability to provide cost share support for fencing. Moved by Member Wellsheim, seconded by Member Koob.**

*Discussion:*

- Member Hendrickson asked that the final management plan and budget come back to the committee after NRCS determines its availability to provide cost share support for fencing.

**Approve: Koch, Gagné, Koob, Constantinides, Wellsheim, Conant, Dunbar, Kaulukukui, Kyono, Hendrickson; Opposed: None; Abstain: J. Friday.**

**Motion passed.**

- Agenda item 14, Forest Legacy 2017 applications, was moved up in the agenda to item 8.

## **8. Forest Legacy 2017 Applications:**

- The FSAC was given time to review and score proposals based only on the application. The proposals were re-scored after further discussion in order to capture how changes to the applications might affect their scores.
- Ho‘omau Ranch and Helemano were reviewed nationally in FY15, but did not receive funding. For FY16, Helemano potentially ranked high enough to receive funding, but

Ho‘omau did not. Haloa ‘Aina was reviewed by the committee last year, but was not submitted for national review.

### **8.1 FY17 Ho‘omau Ranch**

- Staff Sprecher informed the committee on the updates to the Ho‘omau Ranch application. The acreage of the FY16 application was 764 acres. For the FY17 application, there is an additional 275 acre parcel that TNC wants to do a conservation easement on. This parcel will be offered as cost share to the FL acquisition of the 764 acre parcel. The State will hold the 764 acres, and TNC will hold the CE title to the 275 acres. The total acquisition cost is \$2.7 million, and the CE request is \$2 million. An appraisal was done in 2011, but a new appraisal should be completed in November. A draft management plan was submitted and is being reviewed by staff. Regarding readiness points, a market analysis, preliminary appraisal, management plan draft and title search and been completed.

- Member J. Friday questioned why cattle grazing is part of the plan. Staff Sprecher said that the intention is to do light rotational grazing in the open pastures to keep the weeds down. Some of the weeds that are in need of control are balloon weed, Florida beggarweed, strawberry guava, Russian olive, mysore raspberry, African tulip, and Christmas berry.

- Member Hendrickson felt that the threat of the area being subdivided is low because of how far down south the property is. There is a possibility for it to be converted to non-forest uses, but it probably would not be economically feasible at this time.

- Staff Sprecher commented that during national review, the review committee remembered the huge subdivision, and wanted to know how many of those lots were sold and if it was enough to meet the development needs in the area already. The project scored low on importance. Projects need to be significant in a number of importance areas, not just endangered species. The new addition will help the importance score, but threat is not as high as somewhere like Haloa ‘Aina. She added that the largest specimen of mēhamehame they have seen is located on the martin paddock.

- Member Wellsheim asked if the landowner was exploring other mechanisms to save the palms. Staff Sprecher said they are working with the Plant Extinction Prevention Program on outplanting. They also want to protect the adult trees by fencing the area and are also looking into obtaining an endangered species permit to do outplanting of the palms on their property.

### **8.2 FY17 Haloa ‘Aina**

- Staff Sprecher reminded the committee that this 2,900 acre project was reviewed last year. An appraisal and market analysis were completed in 2011, and there is a possibility of doing a preliminary appraisal before national review. A title search was provided and there is a draft stewardship plan. The asking price is \$5 million.

- Guest Lee explained that the property is part of his family’s ahupua‘a. It was auctioned to the Greenwell family in 1857, who clear cut and burned the area for grazing in 1955. The Pace family bought in 1986, and Guest Lee’s family bought the property from them in 2010. The original canopy was 110 feet of mostly koa and ‘ōhi‘a, with some sandalwood, naio, ‘ōhelo, māmane, pūkiawe, and maile. With only 7-8 species, it is not a very diverse ecosystem. They receive about 10-40 inches of rain per year.

- Member Koob felt that since the application states that palila habitat will be provided, the existence of māmane as potential habitat the site should be mentioned.

- Member Dunbar asked what the \$15M noted in the importance section went toward. Guest Lee said that is the operational cost they have incurred for planting trees, and making oil from dead and dying sandalwood trees. They only sell the oil from dead and dying trees.
- Chair Koch said that the project is strategically located since the surrounding areas are being managed for ecological restoration.
- Member J. Friday stated that regarding threat, the Hokukano subdivision could be cleared. Guest Lee added that when he first bought the parcels, there were only 2. Now there are 25, with most of the subdivision happening within the last 3 years. He is interested in doing a conservation easement to ensure that future generations lose the ability to develop.
- Member Koob asked if sandalwood mulch really deters fire ants. Guest Lee said that they have found that the mulch does deter fire ants and coqui frogs. Member Koob suggested highlighting this as a non-timber use if they have data for it.
- Staff Sprecher said the terms for the easement are not finalized at this stage, but there have been discussions with the landowner on some of the requirements that would go in the easement. These include limiting subdivision and development, and forest management.
- Chair Koch clarified that Forest Solutions was involved in editing the application and submitted a letter of support.
- Member J. Friday said the project is important because it would be a working sandalwood forest in the United States.
- Member Lee said they will also be planting pūkiawe, ‘a‘ali‘i, ‘ōhi‘a, koa, and naio.

### **8.3 FY17 Helemano Wilderness Area**

- Staff Sprecher informed the committee on updates to the Helemano application, which is being resubmitted for FY17 since it may not receive funding for FY16. As the project developed, the project area changed with parcels being added to total just over 3,000 acres. The parcel shape has also changed from the original application. Dole, who owns all of the parcels, is proposing to subdivide the area closest to town for other agricultural uses.
- Staff Sprecher explained that parcel 001 was used for pineapple and grazing, and is mostly weedy. As you go east, it becomes a mixed stand. At the upper elevation areas, it is more native dominated with ‘ōhi‘a, uluhe, koa, pūkiawe. Parcel 003 has native forest and could be a good place for bat mitigation. Parcel 001 will be the first timber management area on O‘ahu. There will also be associated recreational opportunities. The access trail is big component of this project. Some discussion about the management has included providing some subleasing. Some potential grant funding sources that would help with establishment have been identified.
- Chair Koch liked that more heavy recreation opportunities, such as ATV and camping, will be provided since the area is degraded anyway and those opportunities are limited on O‘ahu.
- Staff Sprecher said that the preliminary appraisal puts the project in a range of \$15-17M. A title report has been provided, and no stewardship plan is required for fee acquisitions projects. \$5.3M is being requested from the Forest Legacy (FL) Program. They have raised \$300,000, the City is contributing \$2M, and the Navy is interested in providing \$4M.
- Member Wellsheim asked what happens if the funding for FY16 ends up becoming available, but the area has increased. Staff Sprecher said they will discuss amending the proposal and pull the FY 17 application. One project cannot ask for more than \$7M, and the

State has a total limit of \$10M. If the total of all of the submitted projects is more than that, it will need to be decreased. If Helemano does not receive funding for FY16, they will consider asking for \$3M for FY 17.

- Staff Sprecher said that the area around parcel 001 is currently fallow pineapple land, houses, and gentleman estates. On parcel 001, there is mostly low intensity agriculture.
- FSAC members submitted their re-scores for each project to staff.

### Ho'omau Ranch

FSAC Member	Importance	Threatened	Strategic	Total
Alvin Kyono	30	20	25	77
Koa Kaulukukui	25	10	25	62
Michael Constantinides	17	16	27	62
Greg Hendrickson	22	15	22	61
Rich von Wellsheim	24	17	23	64
Kip Dunbar	30	20	30	82
JB Friday	25	18	25	70
Gregory Koob	28	15	30	75
Patrick Conant	25.9	18	30	75.9
Nicholas Koch	10	20	30	62
<b>Total</b>	267 out of 300 (possible)	169 out of 200 (possible)	267 out of 300 (possible)	672 out of 800 (possible)

### Haloa 'Aina

FSAC Member	Importance	Threatened	Strategic	Total
Alvin Kyono	25	20	25	72
Koa Kaulukukui	25	10	30	67
Michael Constantinides	18	15	23	58
Greg Hendrickson	22	17	25	66
Rich von Wellsheim	27	19	25	71
Kip Dunbar	29	17	30	76
JB Friday	27	17	25	69
Gregory Koob	22	15	23	62
Patrick Conant	11.1	20	20	53.1
Nicholas Koch	25	20	30	77
<b>Total</b>	231 out of 300 (possible)	170 out of 200 (possible)	256 out of 300 (possible)	657 out of 800 (possible)

### Helemano

FSAC Member	Importance	Threatened	Strategic	Total
Alvin Kyono	10	15	20	47
Koa Kaulukukui	30	20	30	83
Michael Constantinides	19	19	25	65

Greg Hendrickson	25	18	28	74
Rich von Wellsheim	28	19	24	71
Kip Dunbar	20	20	20	63
JB Friday	5	18	25	48
Gregory Koob	28	20	28	58
Patrick Conant	25.9	20	22.5	71.4
Nicholas Koch*	30	5	30	67
<b>Total</b>	<b>221 out of 300 (possible)</b>	<b>174 out of 200 (possible)</b>	<b>253 out of 300 (possible)</b>	<b>647 out of 800 (possible)</b>

Project	Average	Ranking
Ho‘omau Ranch	67.2	1
Haloa ‘Aina	65.7	2
Helemano	64.7	3

**Motion to approve and submit Ho‘omau Ranch, Haloa ‘Aina, and Helemano Wilderness Area to the Forest Legacy Program for Federal Fiscal Year 2017 funding. Moved by Member Hendrickson, seconded by Member Conant.**

**Approve: Koch, Koob, Wellsheim, Conant, Dunbar, Constantinides, Kaulukukui, Kyono, Hendrickson; Opposed: None; Abstain: Gagné, J. Friday.**

**Motion passed.**

**Motion to not prioritize the projects given that the scores are close. Moved by Member Hendrickson, seconded by Member Kyono.**

*Discussion:*

- Member Conant commented that he liked the way the projects were currently ranked out based on the scores. Guest K. Friday noted that ranking the projects may help or hurt the project depending on the situation.
- Gregory Koob said that he ranked applications differently after discussing the projects and getting more clarification. He felt it was beneficial for the applicant to be at the meeting.

**Approve: Koch, Koob, Wellsheim, Conant, Dunbar, Kaulukukui, Kyono, Hendrickson; Opposed: None; Abstain: Gagné, J. Friday, Constantinides.**

**Motion passed.**

*Discussion:*

- Staff Sprecher said that if the state is asking for more than the limit of \$10M for the 3 projects, the committee could make recommendations as to how the amount ask gets reduced, or they could leave it to DOFAW to determine.
- Staff Sprecher asked the committee if they had recommendations for the application process. Member Conant wants to know canopy cover and dominant species. Member Hendrickson said it would be helpful to encourage the applicants to attend the meeting.

## **9. Forest Legacy Project Updates:**

- Staff Sprecher provided the committee with updates on FL projects. Kaawaloa, the only closed project, closed in January 2015. The only open project is at Kukaiiau. Kukaiiau will be pulled from program because the original applicant is no longer making decisions, and trustees

are looking at selling off the ranch. For FY16, Helemano ranked 14<sup>th</sup> with \$3M, which was less than the asking price. The probable cut-off is 19. National funding of \$54M would be needed to fund Helemano. Puaahala was submitted, but did not score high enough to make the ranking list. Ho‘omau Ranch was ranked at 24, so it is unlikely to receive funding.

- For the FY17 proposal for Helemano, Dole is proposing to subdivide TMK 6-4-004:001 and sell part of it to Aloun Farms. This would decrease the area from 1,618 to 1,395 acres. A request will also be made to add three additional parcels to the total project, increasing the total area to 3,057 acres. When the project area acreage and configuration changes, the State needs to get a review from FSAC and approval from Forest Service.

- If the FY16 proposal is funded the committee could recommend to DOFAW to proceed with the reduced acreage on TMK 64004001, or bargain to add the extra parcels.

**Motion to recommend DOFAW to proceed with reducing the acreage of TMK 6-4-004:001 for the FY16 proposal, while jockeying for position with the increase in size with the additional parcels. Moved by Member Wellsheim, seconded by Member Kyono.**

**Approve: Koch, Koob, Wellsheim, Conant, Dunbar, Constantinides, Kaulukukui, Kyono, Hendrickson; Opposed: J. Friday; Abstain: Gagné.**

**Motion passed.**

#### **10. Pia Valley Forest Legacy Donation:**

- Staff Sprecher explained that DOFAW has been offered a donation of 300 acres of land in Pia Valley on O‘ahu to be under the Forest Legacy Program. In exchange, DOFAW would use Forest Legacy appropriated due diligence funding to close the project.

- Member Gagné said that the Natural Area Reserves System (NARS) Commission voted unanimously to approve the proposal. Pia Valley is one of the branches of Niu Valley, and can be accessed via the Hawai‘i Loa Ridge trail. They are still working out how to make it a donation to FLP. Once it formally becomes State land, the division will go to the Board of Land and Natural Resources to add it to the NARS.

**Motion to approve the donation of land to the forest legacy program. Moved by Member Dunbar, seconded by Member Kyono.**

**Approve: Koch, Koob, Wellsheim, Conant, Dunbar, Constantinides, Kaulukukui, Kyono, Hendrickson, J. Friday; Opposed: none; Abstain: Gagné.**

**Motion passed.**

#### **11. Forest Legacy Assessment of Needs Permitted Interaction Group (PIG) report:**

- Staff Sprecher explained that the PIG is outside of the FSAC so they are not subject to the Sunshine law. The PIG was created to have discussions and make recommendations on revising the AON, and was required to report back at a future meeting. The FSAC can then have discussions and come up with recommendations as a committee at a future meeting.

- Member Hendrickson said that the AON is regulatory document that allows the State to participate in the program, defines eligible areas, and articulates priorities and intentions of the State. It should also be a meaningful resource for people who want to participate. The document is extensive, so readability and usability should be kept in mind.

- Prior to the 2004 revision of the AON, the only eligible area was South Kona. The priority areas were considered too limited to South Kona, especially when the Wao Kele O Puna

project came about. In 2014, the Forest Service also recommended that DOFAW revisit the AON. The Forest Service recommended better defining appropriate forest uses. In addition to DOFAW, the FSAC has primary role in revising the AON according to the implementation guidelines. DOFAW will be responsible for directing public review and comment.

- Member Hendrickson summarized the PIG report. For recreation, one issue was defining the priorities for activities associated with Forest Legacy Acquisitions, and determining what might be appropriate or inappropriate types of recreation. The PIG felt that there are 3 levels of recreation: clearly inappropriate, clearly appropriate, and a gray area in between. Things in the gray area could require review and the inclusion of an approved recreation management plan in the easement.
- The second issue of recreation was clarifying the significance of hunting to Hawai'i forest use. The PIG felt there is an important relationship to hunting that exists historically and culturally, and is an important way people interact with resource landscapes. If managed well, hunting can be used as a service to help manage the lands and is another forest product.
- For timber, one issue was determining what types of harvest levels or criteria for determination would be viewed as sustainable use. The PIG found that it will be a challenge to define the terms or harvest levels that would fit all projects. In-depth dialogue would be needed to determine what principles make sense for the project and what forest management can do for the forest in terms of health and economics of landowners.
- The AON emphasizes that exotic hardwoods are the primary wood available for forest production. The PIG felt exotic hardwoods are currently not as relevant in the industry, and prefer to see the document more oriented toward native hardwood management.
- The AON needs to be updated with new information on tax structures, soils, minerals, and available matching sources.
- The PIG also discussed summarizing and streamlining the AON. Given that it is currently an appendix of the Forest Action Plan (FAP), it would be possible to streamline the AON by removing information found in the FAP making less duplicative. The State is going through process of updating the FAP. Incorporating the private landowner assistance programs into the FAP would also help streamline the AON. Guest K Friday said the law for FL requires certain things to be addressed by the AON. One problem that arose with recreation was that the AON did not mention certain kinds of recreation that were mentioned in FAP.
- There are 6 areas of emphasis currently listed in the AON. The PIG discussed adding other areas that are receiving additional pressure that could be considered priority. They felt that it might make sense not to have any priority areas. Staff Sprecher said that having priority areas may make projects more strategic. At the same time however, if most projects come out of the same area, it does not mean much. Given the number of applications submitted every year, Hawai'i may need to be more opportunistic instead of strategic, by eliminating priority areas.
- Land in the conservation district is 1 of the 4 criteria that the eligible area is based off of. Conservation district (CD) land has a difficult time ranking well in the threatened category, so the PIG discussed whether it should even be a requirement. It may more appropriate to have agricultural designated land. Removing the CD would have impacts however. Projects such as Wao Kele O Puna and Helemano have CD land that is valuable to the project. Staff Sprecher added that the State does have an interest in acquiring fee title for lands in the conservation district. The PIG wanted to know what kinds of permits have been allowed in the conservation

district, how often conservation district zoned land has downgraded, and what the eligible area would look if the CD was removed and agricultural district added.

- The PIG discussed changing or expanding the eligibility criteria to possibly include agricultural zoned land. The committee reviewed maps showing the different zones outside of government owned lands.
- The PIG felt it would be helpful for the AON to better mirror the articulated categories that are used during national review. For both importance and threat, applicants should be able to distinguish if it is something they can mention in their proposal relating to those categories.
- Strategic is currently not mentioned in the AON. The PIG felt it should be included to help applicants understand what might be of strategic importance in context of their land.
- Member Dunbar asked if past projects that scored well during the national review could be used to help articulate what is important or what scores well in the AON. Member Hendrickson agreed saying they should look at successful projects here and elsewhere to help articulate the scoring categories and give context within each.
- The PIG recommended removing prime forest land as eligibility criteria. It is currently based on productivity, but that is not a priority in Hawai'i.
- Regarding non-timber forest products, the PIG felt it should be expanded upon. A variety of non-timber forest products that we see now, such as carbon, hunting, and sandalwood should be included.
- The wildlife section of the AON is currently focused on threatened and endangered species. The PIG recommended including restoration and recovery actions as well.
- The PIG discussed if certain conservation easement terms should be articulated in the AON. They felt they should not, given the difficulty of being able to frame it out in a way that would not create problems.
- The PIG felt that lowland forests could be a priority area given its limited extent.
- Member Dunbar asked if the things the national committee valued differed from year to year. Member Hendrickson did not think it varied that dramatically.
- Staff Sprecher added that applicants who tied threat and importance to their AON scored better. Some proposals identified threats that were outside of development, but because it was identified in their AON, it still scored well.
- Guest K. Friday said the State can define what it sees as threats and values through the AON rather than trying to align it with an abstract federal definition.
- Following the PIG report, Staff Sprecher stated that the PIG is now dissolved. The committee could have additional discussion or make decisions on this item at a future meeting. To revise the AON, DOFAW can hire a contractor. DOFAW would also need to do public meetings and query land trust partners.
- Member Koch added that input from the committee is needed on defining sustainable timber management and priority areas.

## **12. Meeting Adjournment of Day 1 at 5:00pm**

## **13. Call to Order:**

- Meeting was called to order at 8:00am am by Chair Koch.

**14. Forest Stewardship project updates:**

- Staff Sprecher informed the FSAC that there are 64 landowners on an email list, 12 potential projects whose management plans have been approved. 8 projects have approved management plans but are not seeking cost share reimbursement. There are 12 landowners that are working on developing management plans.

**15. Forest Stewardship landowner informational reports:**

- Staff Nanbara informed the committee that the informational reports were not ready yet. The reports were done to get more people involved in the program by helping facilitate landowner to landowner interactions.

**16. Hawai'i CREP project updates and activities**

- Staff Nanbara updated the committee on Hawai'i CREP. There are 18 CREP contracts, 3 of which were enrolled this year. 5 conservation plans were completed this year, bring the total acres under the program to 982. The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation grant that was funding the 2 CREP planners ended in August. Some of last year's CREP funds, as well as \$50,000 from NRCS are being used to retain them. During the grant period, the planners conducted outreach at 41 events and reached 245 landowners. 6 contracts were completed and 113 site visits were conducted. The planners recently participated in a CREP field day at Ahu Lani sanctuary. John Lindelow talked to the 26 attendees about his experience in the program.

**17. Chapter 195F, HRS, 2015 Legislative Proposal**

- For the 2015 legislative session, DOFAW requested to amend the Forest Stewardship statute to clean up terms of the names of some of the practices, and open up eligibility to more landowners. Currently, there is language that says timber projects can only be done on land that was cleared prior to 1991. DOFAW also asked to increase cost share support for the development of management plans to 75%. The bill was heard in the senate and house, and one bill did cross over. There was some confusion of the language regarding the native forest production. The House chair of the environmental committee wanted to know more about the data behind the proposal. The bill is alive and may be heard in the 2016 session.

**18. Forest Stewardship budget and ranking:**

- Various projects were evaluated using the evaluation criteria sheet to see how they compared to one another. The committee was asked to discuss if this method works or if they want to modify it.
- Staff Chee, who completed the evaluation, noticed that projects without production or water components scored lower than those who did not have those components. Irene commented that the criteria was pulled from the spatial analysis project
- Chair Koch said if funding becomes limited, scores would be important in determining which projects should get funded. If there is not a lot of funding available, those who prepare the plans may want to look at the evaluation criteria to help it score better. Member Wellsheim was concerned that if applicants are given the criteria, they might alter their plans so they can score higher. It might make more sense to parallel native biodiversity and productivity so the score would not be affected so much if you only did one.

- Member J. Friday wanted to know what the implications would be for funding, and if they would have to fund so many projects doing production and so many doing conservation. He suggested going back and scoring projects that do strictly production, such as Trimarco. The sheet is more of a tool to help rank projects, but is not going to give the final answer.
- Staff Sprecher updated the committee on the budget. The program was budgeted \$350,000 for the cost share agreement portion. For projects currently on list, \$308,000 has been committed. There is an additional \$10,000 for supporting the development of management plans.

#### **19. Forest Stewardship Payback Provisions:**

- The committee discussed the current rules for payback provision for commercial timber production projects as well as the possibility of payback provisions for other types of commercial production such as agroforestry and ecotourism.
- Chair Koch asked if a landowner would still need to payback if they did tours on an area that did not use funds, but is part of the management plan. Member J. Friday agreed saying the timber provision is clear, but if somewhere like Ahu Lani did eco tours, it would be difficult to require them to payback, unless there is a trail that is being used to make money.
- Staff Sprecher clarified that the money goes back into the program.
- Guest Friday pointed out that doing provisions for short term activities such as agroforestry and ecotourism would create too much paper work and hassle. It would make more sense to make decision points upfront on what were are going to give money for.
- Member Conant asked if any provided funds have gone toward ecotourism. Staff Sprecher said not directly.
- Member Hendrickson asked how they arrived at the numbers in the contract. Staff Sprecher said it is the amount of funding that they originally had in their management plan that is directed toward timber production.
- Member J. Friday commented that there has not been any push back from landowners on the payback for timber.
- Member Koob asked about species credits. Landowners can be paid if they have the appropriate landscape. For example, wind farms that put money into creating landscape for mitigation could be double dipping. Member J. Friday asked if that would be figured out in the management plan. Member Koob said that they may not know upfront. He clarified that the money would not come from government agency, but it from industry that is doing the take.
- Staff Sprecher said if they want more flexibility in dealing with new things such as species banking, they should look at expanding the provision beyond timber. Member Wellsheim agreed saying if funds are used to help improve lands that end up generating revenue, some should go back to the program.
- Staff Sprecher stated that landowners who develop management plans are not required to enroll in the cost share assistance agreement. If projects receive cost share assistance, a payback provision would be incorporated into the contract, only on areas that our funds go to. If a timber harvest is done on either existing trees or trees planted by the program, then they are subject to the provision.
- Staff Sprecher said another PIG could be formed to discuss this, or it can be sent to the Attorney General's office for their opinion. Staff Sprecher said if this it taken to the AG's

office, it would be helpful for the committee or a PIG to lay out some of the concerns and background information.

- Member Hendrickson asked about selling products such as sandalwood oil, but not the timber. Member J. Friday said they can do a stumpage rate.
- The item was tabled for the next meeting.

## **20. Natural Area Partnership Management Plans**

- Staff Sprecher explained that the Forest Service recommended DOFAW to review the Natural Area Partnership Program (NAPP) management plans to see if they fit the Forest Stewardship plan criteria. The purpose is to fully capture this type of management and program reach for reporting.
- Staff Chee reviewed 9 NAPP plans by looking at the Federal guidelines and plan criteria for the FSP to see if they qualify. The plans generally met the national criteria for Forest Stewardship plans. The only criteria that were not met were the plans are not signed as being reviewed by the state forester, the author is not specified, and the management activities are not always ordered chronologically as detailed as FSP plans.
- Member Gagné said the plans are first reviewed by the NARS commission and internally then sent to the land board for approval. The long range plans cover 6 years and are reviewed annually.
- Staff Sprecher said that we may need to recommend small modifications to the NARS Commission to help bring the NAPP plans up to the standard of FSP plans.
- The committee supported the NAPP plans qualifying under FSP.

## **21. Landscape Scale Forest Stewardship Plans**

- Guest K. Friday explained that the federal guidelines are being revised to recognize landscape plans. After priority areas are defined, plans would outline what is needed to address the values of the area. Landowners within the area would then be encouraged to make individual management plans to the achieve goals of the landscape plan. Hawai'i utilizes watershed partnerships in the same way, so we will be presenting this at the federal level.
- Member Hendrickson wondered how it would this concept folded in to the joint forestry MOU so each agency views this landscape plan with the same level of appreciation. If you do designate priority areas in AON, might encourage landowners in those areas to develop landscape plans.

## **22. Follow up on AON: timber, priority areas, and defining sustainable harvest**

- Staff Sprecher said that the prime forest layer is mostly focused on agricultural lands.
- Guest K. Friday said it would be good to look at ecosystem services such as aquifer recharge and carbon, separately from non-timber forest products such as sandalwood oil.
- Member Hendrickson noted that it is difficult to define sustainable harvest levels because native forest management, plantation style forestry, and nonnative management are all different. He suggested having 2 tracks.
- Member J. Friday also felt it would be difficult to define sustainable harvest levels. Member Hendrickson said landowners should be given guidance so they know what to expect in terms of harvest levels. The idea is not to be extremely detailed, but to provide high level

concepts that are informative. The AON should be useful so that landowners understand what they have to do to be part of program.

### **23. Forest Action Plan**

- Staff Sprecher summarized the 9 chapters of the Forest Action Plan (FAP). She explained that there is not much in the FAP about getting private landowners to create long term management plans or about acquisitions. They want the private assistant programs to be better integrated into the FAP since it applies to private lands as well. The committee was asked to provide advice on what should be included.
- Member Conant suggested following what NARS does. They are mandated to have representatives from all habitat types. He felt that dry and mesic communities should be prioritized in FSP and FLP. Staff Sprecher said they could pull information that identifies parcels of dry forest that are remaining.
- Member Hendrickson added that it would also be helpful to identify areas are suitable for the regeneration of dryland forests.
- Chair Koch suggested bringing this item up again at the next meeting.

### **24. Announcement and Travel**

- The committee decided to meet in November to discuss the AON and FAP in Honolulu.

### **25. Meeting Adjournment of Day 2 at 10:05 am**