

Forest Stewardship Advisory Committee Meeting

Division of Forestry & Wildlife
Waimea Valley Pikake Pavilion
59-864 Kamehameha Hwy.
Haleiwa, HI 96712
May 2, 2014

Present: Nicholas Koch (Chair-elect), Betsy Gagné (Ex-officio), Alvin Kyono, Michael Constantinides, Mark White, Rich von Wellsheim, Koa Kaulukukui, Laura Brezinsky, J. Friday, Greg Hendrickson, Kip Dunbar, Jay Warner

Staff: Irene Sprecher, Malia Nanbara, Marissa Chee

Guests: Laurent Pool, Connie Laumann, Puaonauna Stibbard, Katie Friday, Teresa Dawson, Richard Pezzulo, Josephine Hoh, Brian Belcher

1. Meeting Site Visit:

Committee members and interested guests met at the Waimea Valley Visitor Center and conducted a site visit from 9:00 am – 12:00 pm.

2. Call to Order:

Meeting was called to order at 12:00 pm by Chair-elect Koch. Jay Warner was introduced to the committee as the newest member.

3. Meeting Minutes - January 24, 2014:

The FSAC reviewed the meeting minutes from the January 24, 2014 meeting and made the following corrections and comments:

- Member Gagné provided written corrections to staff.
- Page 4, paragraph 2: Member Hendrickson stated that “not goals” should be replaced with “not reflect goals”.
- Page 6, last line: Chair-elect Koch stated that “Pronamide” should be replaced with “Picloram”.
- Page 11: Guest K. Friday elaborated on the withdrawal of her application as a voting member stating that she is attending as a non-voting advisor instead.

Motion to approve the January 24, 2014 FSAC meeting minutes as corrected. Moved by Member Kyono, seconded by Member Gagné.

Approve: Koch, Gagné, Kyono, Constantinides, White, Kaulukukui, Brezinsky, J. Friday, Hendrickson, Dunbar, Warner; Oppose: none; Abstain: Wellsheim.

Motion passed.

4. Forest Stewardship Program (FSP) Project Proposals

4.1 Keauhou Bird Conservancy Discovery Forest Proposal, Hawaii County

- Staff Sprecher and Chair-elect Koch introduced the project proposal as a management plan for a 200 acre forest restoration project that is entirely focused on providing habitat and food for forest birds through forest restoration. This project is easily accessible and would provide good educational opportunities.

- Chair-elect Koch and Member J. Friday recused themselves due to associations with the project.

Discussion:

- Member Constantinides questioned why pruning and forest stand improvement were seen as necessary. Chair-elect Koch clarified that only thinning will be included because after a canopy is established, some of the fruit trees will need more light.
- Member Constantinides wanted to see more detail on who is going to do the work for a project of this scale, since using only volunteers seems inefficient. He suggested setting aside small areas for volunteers and using a commercial outfit for larger scale installation.
- Member Hendrickson questioned why the cost share estimates presented were different than those in the proposal. Staff Sprecher said one of the quotes included in-kind costs, so the estimate is based off of the actual cost of development of the management plan.
- Member Kyono asked why fire prevention was not selected as a natural resource concern. Chair-elect Koch stated that the area receives a high amount of annual rainfall.
- Chair-elect Koch clarified that the type of fencing used is hog wire with barbed wire on top.
- Staff Sprecher clarified that only cost share for the development of the management plan is being requested.
- Chair-elect Koch clarified that the fruit bearing trees were selected based on the forest birds.
- Member Hendrickson asked for clarification regarding the legal relationships. Chair-elect Koch explained that the land owner, Kamehameha Schools (KS), has a 35 year lease with Keauhou Bird Conservation Center (KBCC) and the San Diego Zoo. KBCC has a memorandum of agreement (MOA) with Hawaii Forest Institute (HFI).
- Member Hendrickson asked if KBCC is the actual applicant, and if an MOA was sufficient to establish an interest that the FSP would fund. Staff Sprecher stated that Hawaii Forest Institute (HFI) is the applicant, and that this would have to be reviewed by an Attorney General. DOFAW has entered into contract agreements under MOAs in other programs.
- Member White said that KS can be unsure about accepting public money for certain projects. Staff Sprecher said that the school is primarily concerned about receiving federal funds. Since a significant amount state funding goes toward FSP, they could direct only state funding for the development of the management plan if there is a problem. Member Gagné added that if the federal money goes toward KBCC, it will not go through KS, which is their biggest concern.
- Guest K. Friday pointed out that in the future, the state funding might not qualify as a match if KS does not sign off on the Civil Rights.
- Member Kaulukukui felt this was a well written proposal and asked how it would fit into the budget. Staff Sprecher said that there is sufficient amount of money to cover the development of this management plan. She added that the FSAC will need to discuss whether they were going to fund cost share on management plans related to budget.

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 Gagné, seconded by Member Wellsheim.

Continued discussion:

- Member Constantinides proposed an amendment that cost share be contingent on staff confirming this applicant is eligible.

Motion to amend the previous motion was accepted by Member Gagné, seconded by Member Wellsheim. 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 \$2500, provided that the applicant is eligible.

**Approve: Gagné, Kyono, Constantinides, White, Kaulukukui, Brezinsky, Hendrickson, Dunbar, Warner, Wellsheim; Oppose: none; Abstain: Koch, J. Friday.
Motion Passed.**

4.2 Black Rhino Foundation, Hawaii County

- Staff Sprecher introduced the project proposal as a management plan for 200 acres that will be focused on planting koa and sandalwood for native tree production.

Discussion:

- Member J. Friday was unclear whether the project will be doing restoration or economic production. He felt that if it is going to be a business, a financial analysis should be provided. If native forest planting is involved, there should be community outreach or else it is just expensive landscaping.

- Member Gagné felt that watershed protection would not be accomplished if harvesting is done. Staff Sprecher pointed out that the project is looking to maintain a sustainable yield which would imply that trees will be left on the property.

- Chair-elect Koch felt that the cost of irrigation being 40% of the budget was not warranted given that the area receives 40 inches of rainfall a year.

- Member J. Friday felt that although it is ok to plant fruit trees, the program should not provide cost share if they are used for agriculture. Staff Sprecher stated that the program will not fund orchards, but will fund agroforestry services such as wind breaks, soil fertility, etc.

- Staff Sprecher stated that in addition to lilikoi, sapote will be grown, which has shown to be a good host tree for sandalwood. Member J. Friday said there would be no problem providing funding if the sapote is being planted as a host tree for Sandalwood.

- Chair-elect Koch recused himself because his business provided one of the quotes.

- Member White and J. Friday felt that the restoration and commercial components should be clearer and more thought out before developing a management plan. Staff Sprecher added that the objectives would be more clearly defined during plan development.

- Staff Sprecher clarified that consulting firm contacted her at the request of the landowner, The Black Rhino Foundation. Staff received confirmation from the landowner that they support the project, so the application is from landowner and not the firm.

- Staff Sprecher stated that a site visit has not been conducted yet, but will be done if the development of a management plan is approved.

- The FSAC discussed the presence of *Santalum paniculatum* and *Santalum ellipticum* in the elevation range of the project. Member J. Friday said *paniculatum* can grow at that elevation, and added that *ellipticum* should be there but is not recorded. According to Staff Sprecher, it has been seen in that range. Before developing the management plan, the species of native sandalwood that is most appropriate for the property should be determined.
- Member Brezinsky asked why irrigation is needed if sandalwood was observed to grow well without it, and if it is wise to pay for planting if it cannot survive the dry season without irrigation. Member J. Friday felt that using irrigation to establish the trees and then wean them off by moving the lines to the next years' plantings would be a viable option.
- Member Hendrickson commented that the microclimate may be drastically different because there are no trees there, so what is needed for reestablishment is unclear. Member Brezinsky asked if sandalwood would be establishing in the area, or reestablishing.
- Member Dunbar questioned if Christmas berry thickets really reduce erosion because they are known to increase sedimentation if they become very dense.
- The FSAC pointed out that the location should be Ocean View, not Mountain View.
- Member Constantinides made several comments. He asked for clarification as to why they feel wind is a problem being that windbreaks are unusual in forests, and how they would address it. Lilikoi could potentially be a problem due to its invasive potential, which should be considered. More details are needed on implementation as well.

Motion for project proposal to be deferred, sent back to the applicant with comments, and resubmitted. Moved by Member Wellsheim, seconded by Member Dunbar.

Continued discussion:

- Member Wellsheim wanted more clarity on if this project is a commercial endeavor, where the public access is, what the public benefit is. Staff Sprecher stated that it is a forest production project.
- Member Brezinsky felt that windbreaks are just their way of planting fruit trees. Staff Sprecher said that sandalwood has been shown to grow better when protected from wind.
- Member J. Friday said that if Staff is satisfied that the project is clearly a commercial venture, he would approve inviting them to write a management plan, as long as they submit a financial analysis in the plan.
- Member Wellsheim wanted the landowner to do more research on what historically existed there, which species of sandalwood is appropriate to plant, and the invasive potential of lilikoi. He would rather they address these issues and resubmit a more well thought out proposal before the FSP spends money on developing the management plan.
- Guest K. Friday and Member Kyono felt that the program's responsibility is to provide advice and guidance that will address these issues during management plan development. It is not necessary to send the proposal back when the committee can control the approval of the management plan later. Member Brezinsky commented that the committee should send them in the right direction before having them write the plan.

Voting: Approve: Kaulukukui, Dunbar, Warner, Gagné, Wellsheim, White, Brezinsky; Oppose: Hendrickson, Kyono, Constantinides; Abstain: Koch, J. Friday. Motion passed.

Continued Discussion:

- Staff Sprecher reminded the committee that their role in reviewing project proposals is to recommend the proposals that are eligible for the program. The proposals should include the objectives, proposed practices, and nature of resources to be managed.
- Member Hendrickson and Guest K. Friday felt that the committee should not be voting against projects just because they do not agree with what they are proposing. Member Dunbar felt that proposals should be submitted in a way that shows an understanding of their property, objectives, and how they plan to meet their objectives.
- Member Constantinides asked if they could approve proposals with little to no cost share assistance if the committee is not confident in the project. The applicant could accept that and move forward to the management plan or work on the proposal more and resubmit it to get more money. Staff Sprecher said that the Administrator could decide to do that.

4.3 Pace Demonstration Forest, Hawaii County

- Staff Sprecher introduced the project proposal as a management plan for a 400 acre portion of Hokukano Ranch, interested in forest restoration and production. There are multiple landowners on the property who are putting their parcels together under one management plan.

Discussion:

- Staff Sprecher clarified that the application is coming from the group of landowners since the intended lessee is not in place yet. Guest K. Friday commented that this is not the first time a group of adjacent landowners has applied.
- Member Hendrickson clarified that the intended lessee, Big Island Forestry, LLC, was formed by the landowners to collectively manage the four parcels. He also provided clarification about the location of the four parcels on the provided map.
- Guest K. Friday asked who John Henshaw is. Member Hendrickson stated that he is a part of a group of foresters who are in the process of acquiring one of the parcels from Hokukano Ranch. He also manages the LLC. Member Hendrickson also clarified which landowner owns which parcel.
- Staff Sprecher stated that all of the landowners have been contacted and support this plan.
- Member J. Friday said that it seems like the landowners are interested in long term production, so a financial analysis should be part of the management plan.
- Staff Sprecher stated that prices for specific management prescriptions were not provided yet because the prescriptions are going to be determined during the development of the management plan. The estimated cost is based on how much they want to apply a particular practice across the property based on hold down rates listed in the FSP handbook.
- Chair-elect Koch recused himself because Forest Solutions is one of the bidders.
- Member J. Friday asked if wildfire is listed in the natural resource concern section. Given that there was a severe burn nearby, he felt that it should be a concern in the future. Staff Sprecher stated that it is included under the fuelbreak practice. He also commented that the project does not seem too complicated.
- Staff Sprecher clarified that all of the roads are privately owned.

- Member Brezinsky asked if other natives besides koa or sandalwood were going to be planted for restoration. Staff Sprecher was not sure, but since the primary goal is forest production which is a part of larger ecosystem management, it should include more diverse vegetation.

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 \$4,000. Moved by Member Wellsheim, seconded by Member Kyono.

Continued discussion:

- Member Constantinides and Member Dunbar did not feel comfortable with the proposed cost-share rate, and felt that it should not exceed \$2,500.
- Member White asked if staff could require a lease be established by the landowners as a condition for accepting funding. Staff Sprecher said that they cannot require them do that. If they decide to do a management plan, all landowners must agree and sign off on it.
- Member Wellsheim stated that he chose a higher cost-share amount because the four landowners are applying together with a larger area. Each landowner could get \$2,500 each if they applied individually. Member J. Friday commented that this property has good connectivity with adjacent projects, so they will be managing the larger landscape.
- Member Brezinsky questioned how they could provide specific seedling and out-planting costs if they do not know what they are going to plant yet. Staff Sprecher stated that the cost share rates are based on the handbook, and that she was not sure if the landowners spoke to anyone about how much components of those practices might cost.

Voting: Approve: Warner, Wellsheim, White, Kyono, Gagné; Oppose: Kaulukukui, Dunbar, Brezinsky, Constantinides; Abstain: Koch, Hendrickson, J. Friday. Motion passed.

4.4 Green Energy, Kauai County:

- Staff Sprecher stated that this project proposal was reviewed at the last FSAC meeting. After the committee questioned the eligibility of the land to participate, staff spoke with an Attorney General who determined they are a non-industrial private landowner.
- Chair-elect Koch recused himself due to an association with the project.

Discussion:

- Staff Sprecher reviewed feedback provided by Green Energy's consultant on the committee's comments. The consultant stated that the project is fully financed and cost forecasts have been reviewed by specialized consultants. Member J. Friday felt that their management plan is already complete, and questioned why more money is being asked for if costs were determined. Staff Sprecher said that a financial analysis on their business has been completed, but not on the management plan portion specifically. In regards to the question about a portion of the property with conservation subzone, the consultant said that it is resource subzone. To highlight public benefit, consultant said that there are multiple benefits such as cheaper electricity, restoring agricultural land, keeping money on island, etc.
- Member J. Friday commented that this is a millions of dollars industrial operation, and felt that the FSP should help landowners who do not have access to professional resources. He would support the program funding a few dozen acres of demonstration forest, but not subsidizing an industrial operation. Staff Sprecher stated that the landowner is eligible, and

the committee is reviewing the application for development of a management plan, not the cost-share support for the implementation of the plan.

- Member Constantinides felt that the financiers would most likely not fund the facility for this project without having a forest management plan. He questioned why there is a request for funding management plan development when they most likely have one.
- Guest K. Friday commented that approving this proposal should be based on eligibility and priority. She suggested referring to the ranking priorities the committee created, and see if the parcel has value beyond biomass production. Chair-elect Koch added that the program should reel in industrial projects so they consider all of the types of resources. They should be considered in a cohesive manner in the management plan.
- Member Dunbar was concerned that the project will not be profitable based on how much hauling will cost, and the acres to be planted.
- Member J. Friday felt that if they are going to run a business, they have to make more money than they put in. He mentioned other projects that stayed in operation until they ran out of subsidies, and did not think it would be a good idea to involve subsidies. Member Hendrickson said that the government decides which industries they want to support.
- Guest K. Friday commented that if the goal is supporting development of a commercial enterprise, it should not be supported if it is a failing enterprise. Staff Sprecher said it would be developed in the financial analysis. Guest K. Friday added that most projects ask to fund public benefit, not to make them more profitable. Member Hendrickson felt this is not what the committee should be debating.
- Staff Sprecher stated that the committee decided biomass projects could be considered for the FSP during a discussion they had half a year ago.
- Member Hendrickson said the committee agreed to utilize a scoring system that looks at multiple ecosystem services. If those services are not provided, they will score low and not receive funding. Biomass projects have the potential to provide these services on top of other benefits. He added that he was concerned about retroactive financing if they already have a plan in place.
- Member Kaulukukui felt that the project was being disingenuous by asking for money for a plan they already developed. Staff Sprecher commented that the committee reviewed a proposed species list for the leasing of the land for the Department of Agriculture. If Staff were to talk with them, they would know if there was an existing plan. Member Kyono did not think they have a formal plan yet. Member Constantinides thought that they do have a modest NRCS plan.
- Chair-elect Koch felt that the program should include everyone and consider everything.

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 \$1,750. Moved by Member Wellsheim, seconded by Member Hendrickson.

Continued discussion:

- Some members did not agree with the motion. Member Brezinsky stated she would only approve the proposal if solid data on project costs was provided. Member Kaulukukui felt

uncomfortable approving the plan because they should have had a plan a long time ago. Member Dunbar was concerned that if the project fails, they will have to be bailed out by tax payers.

- Member Hendrickson felt it would be good to know how other agencies approach land that is going to place in forestry so that the committee does not operate in vacuum.

Voting: Approve: Warner, Hendrickson, Wellsheim, White, Kyono, Gagné, Kaulukukui; Oppose: Brezinsky; Abstain: Dunbar, Constantinides, Koch, J. Friday.
Motion passed.

5. Forest Stewardship Program (FSP) Management Plans

5.1 Waimea Valley Forest Stewardship management plan – Honolulu County:

- Chair-elect Koch recused himself due to an association with the project.
- The FSAC reviewed the project proposal at the February 2013 FSAC meeting. The project manager and land owners were present. The project manager, Laurent Pool, gave an overview of the project. The total property acreage is 1875 acres, with 101 acres in the management plan. The 101 acres are intensively managed, and ungulate control and incipient weed management are done property wide. Laurent Pool described each of the five project sites.
- Member White asked why they chose 100 acres as the focal area since there is potential for managing a larger area. Laurent Pool said that they tried to be realistic by choosing areas that had the most potential, were accessible, and could be easily managed by their small staff.
- Guest K. Friday asked if they have a property wide fire management plan. Laurent Pool said they have one that is not fully implemented, and plan on developing it more.
- Member J. Friday asked if they have any plans for managing Puccinia rust. Laurent Pool stated that they have used the fungicide Rally for the control of the rust on Eugenia. They have not outplanted it because it does not regenerate. Member J. Friday commented that the black twig borer could also be a problem. He suggested looking into using mycorrhizal inoculated seedlings to help get things established in badly eroded soil.
- Member Constantinides congratulated the Waimea staff on their well written plan. He pointed out that if they go to NRCS for potential funding, they should consider leaving work with endangered plants out of their plan since it would trigger a very intensive administrative process. Laurent Pool said that the Eugenia site is a low priority because it is dominated by strawberry guava. Member Constantinides noted that the FSAC views kukui as a Polynesian introduction, not indigenous. He also commented that section 5.3.1 mentions brush management, but in the context of what is being proposed, it should be tree shrub site preparation and herbaceous weed control. In the wetland unit, riparian forest buffer and riparian herbaceous buffer are practices that might cover some of the management activities being proposed.
- Members Dunbar and Brezinsky also felt that plan was well written and straightforward.
- Guest K. Friday understood that they chose the 100 acres they are intensively managing for their plan, but felt that because they are extensively managing the whole property, they should include the whole property in the plan.

Motion to approve the Waimea Valley Forest Stewardship Plan. Moved by Member Gagné, seconded by Member Dunbar.

Continued discussion:

- Member Gagné asked if the committee could recommend including the whole property in the plan. Staff Sprecher said she could work with the Waimea staff to include it.

Voting: Approve: Koch, Gagné, Kyono, Constantinides, White, Kaulukukui, Brezinsky, Hendrickson, Dunbar, Warner, Wellsheim; Opposed: none; Abstain: J. Friday, Koch.
Motion Passed.

5.2 Kaawaloa Forest management plan – Hawaii County:

- Staff Sprecher introduced the plan as a multi-use forest management plan for the Forest Legacy Program. The comments the FSAC made when they reviewed the plan at the January 2013 FSAC meeting are now incorporated in the plan which is being resubmitted. The landowner, Greg Hendrickson who is in attendance as the project representative, is working with DOFAW on the conservation easement project. This plan is similar to the Kealakekua Heritage Range management plan since they are adjoining properties. The committee is only looking at approval of the plan.

- Member Hendrickson clarified where the existing and proposed fences are located on the provided maps. They will create fenced areas as they go along managing unit by unit, and make sure that there are no animals inside once it is fenced.

- Staff Sprecher clarified that the conservation easement is a portion of larger parcel, so the management plan activities only cover the area inside the easement. Member Hendrickson added that certain areas of the property were excluded from the easement because they have dwellings on them.

- Chair-elect Koch asked about fencing incrementally versus doing all of the fencing at one time. Member Hendrickson said that they are looking at two different approaches and may transition during the course of the contract. Currently, they are planning to fence incrementally because they are managing the units in a particular order.

- Guest K. Friday pointed out that bats and the Old Kona Field System were mentioned in the application, but not the plan. Member Hendrickson said that although bats are believed to exist on the property and transects have been completed, they have not been officially observed there. Actual field system structures have not yet been identified on the property, but each site will be reviewed before they begin management. If structures are found, they will be protected onsite. Staff Sprecher added that DOFAW believes that by restoring this forest, bat habitat will be improved and maintained.

- Guest K. Friday commented that for future projects, resources should not be emphasized too much in the proposal if they are not sure it is present. If it is confirmed to be found there, it can be more specifically addressed in the management plan.

- Member J. Friday commented that he was impressed at how professionally the silvicultural prescriptions are implemented at Kealakekua Ranch which is a conservation easement project with the same landowner. He also asked why there is a difference in gross board feet and net board feet. Member Hendrickson said that both are based on merchantable trees 8 inches in diameter or larger. The difference between gross and net is that gross board feet does not incorporate the defect variable, while net does.

- Member J. Friday suggested doing koa thinning earlier than 20 years, especially in dense stands. He was puzzled by pre-commercial thinning of ohia. Member Hendrickson said he was not sure how that would be done since he has not managed for ohia before.
- Member Brezinsky asked what the market for ohia was. Member Hendrickson said that logs sell for about \$1.50 per foot, and boards sell for about \$4.25 per board foot.
- Member J. Friday suggested getting more detail on the land use history, specifically the logging history. Member Hendrickson said they do not know much about the harvest history before the Paces acquired the property in the 1980's. Member Warner said that a sawmill and dry kiln were operating on the property in the early 1980's, so logging and sawing occurred before the Paces owned the property.
- Member Dunbar asked who the holder of the conservation easement is, and what type of restrictions there are on it. Staff Sprecher stated that the DLNR holds the conservation easement. There are restrictions on development, maintenance of roads, and harvesting.
- Member White felt they should consider minimizing the amount of fencing so more money can be spent on other things such as ungulate control and removing cattle. He asked if they could dedicate certain areas for recreational hunting, and other areas for management. Member Hendrickson said that they would like to have a more comprehensive fence in the future. He clarified that they do not intend to graze animals in their herd in the conservation easement area, and will work on removing them. The conservation easement area is not a recreational hunting area. They would prefer an ungulate free area, but are not going focus too much on complete eradication. Staff Sprecher added that a portion excluded from the easement includes a zip-line venture and a hiking trail goes through the easement area.
- Chair-elect Koch followed up on Member J. Friday's comment on diameter breast height and growth rate for koa by adding that the growth rate for koa is very low in this area and predicted it will improve resulting in a higher allowable harvest. Member Hendrickson said they used the same proportion as Kealakekua to determine the allowable harvest under the conservation easement. They plan to harvest well under the permissible allowable harvest. They want to wait and see how things go, and when the growth rates improves, increase the allowable harvest. Staff Sprecher commented that if they want to go beyond the baseline of 175,000 board feet under the conservation easement, they will have to write a different plan.

Motion to approve the Kaawaloa Forest management plan. Moved by Member Kyono, seconded by Member Wellsheim.

Approve: Koch, Gagné, Kyono, Constantinides, White, Kaulukukui, Brezinsky, J. Dunbar, Warner, Wellsheim. Abstain: Member J. Friday and Member Hendrickson.
Motion passed.

5.3 Honolua Wao Kele management plan revision – Maui County:

- Staff Sprecher stated this was a management plan revision from Maui Land and Pine. The necessary information for this plan revision was not received in time for this meeting, so it will be heard at a later meeting.

6. Forest Legacy Program

- Staff Sprecher provided the FSAC with updates regarding the Forest Legacy Program. She clarified that McCandless Ranch, discussed at the last FSAC meeting, was the only project submitted for fiscal year 14. It did not make national list due to eligibility restrictions. The fiscal year 15 projects included Helemano Wilderness Preserve and Hoomau Ranch. At the time of their discussion on these projects at the FSAC last meeting, the list of national rankings had not come out yet. Both projects made the funding list at numbers 28 and 30, but are below the nationally budgeted amount for funded projects, meaning that funding for them may be unlikely. The Presidential budget recommended 53 million dollars for Forest Legacy Projects. If the projects are interested in working with the program next year, staff will work with them to make their application stronger and more competitive.
- Their next meeting will be a Forest Legacy meeting. Staff Sprecher stated that at this time there are no new applications.
- Member K. Friday asked what the rankings are based on. Staff Sprecher said that the national review is closed door. Hawaii has a number of open grant projects that need to be closed, so this could be impacting Hawaii's ability to compete nationally. Staff Sprecher is looking into being a part of the national review team this year which will hopefully provide more insight.

7. Announcements and Travel

- The Natural Area Reserve System Commission and FSAC joint consultation meeting will be scheduled within the next few months. Member Constantinides and Member Kaulukukui represented the FSAC on the Subcommittee last year.
- A majority of the committee liked using Dropbox to access electronic copies of the agenda and project proposals and plans. Member Dunbar, Member Brezinsky, Member Gagné, Member Warner, and Member Constantinides asked to receive hard copies.
- Next meeting: Maui Land and Pine, Maui on September 5 or 12, 2014.

8. Meeting adjourned at 3:10 pm