

Hawaii Invasive Species Council
Resources Working Group
July 30, 2012
Meeting notes

Attendance: Leo Asuncion (DBEDT), Carol Okada (HDOA), Keren Gundersen (KISC), Domingo Cravalho (USFWS), Lori Buchanan (BIISC), Jackie Kozak Thiel (HISC), Kate Cullison (DLNR), Teya Penniman (MISC), Duane Okamoto (City and County of Honolulu), Rachel Neville (OISC), Christy Martin (CGAPS), Joe Kona (KISC), Josh Atwood (HISC), Paul Conry (DLNR).

1. Call to Order (Leo Asuncion)
2. Introductions
3. Review of minutes
 - a. Teya-there is an advantage to having more detailed minutes, can remember what was discussed
 - b. Leo-support more transparency, especially for action items
 - c. Lori moved to approve, Rachel seconded, all moved to approve
4. Discussion of proposed projects
 - a. Established Pest Working Group (Josh for Rob Hauff)
 - i. Goal is to support breadth of projects, biocontrol, axis deer, but also primary goal is to maintain capacity for projects that have been built up over time. At very least wanted to cover salary and fringe for projects.
 - ii. See spreadsheet for rankings and recommended funding
 - iii. Are funding 2 of 3 biocontrol proposals. HISC is funding half and HAWP is funding the other half (committing \$50K)
 - iv. Not funding coconut ants HAL proposal because it was withdrawn
 - v. EPWG funding includes ISCs, HAL core funding, biocontrol, HAL LFA Kauai project, 2 deer projects
 - vi. Clarified with Darcy that they are still able to do area not on cliffside for Kauai LFA project under guidelines of Clean Water Act
 - vii. BI deer project—not able to fund new deer technician since other projects are having to cut staff.
 - viii. Maui deer project—covers salary and fringe and helicopter time, but doesn't fund equipment or supplies, so hopefully county can help with that
 - ix. ISCs—they are high-ranking projects with a high need, we tried to cover as much of the FTE as possible for the ISCs and gave an amount to the managers to divide amongst themselves. They decided to do an equal four way split between the counties. If you combine FTE requests for all the ISCS (includes outreach but not deer) is 1.2M, so we can only cover 75% of the FTE. One of the major goals is to maintain that capacity.

- x. 20K for KRCP—difficult to score. Successful project, but geographically limited and has some procurement issues, but are recommending 50% funding.
- b. Public Outreach Working Group (Christy)
 - i. We tried to keep partial funding for the ISC outreach, which was intention of the WG from the start to make sure there is someone on the ground in each county that can do face-to-face time with people. We are recommending 30K for each ISC, some ISC have more support than others so may want to do switching around.
 - ii. We had a large request from HEAR, we traditionally give 20K to support HISP and HEAR maintenance and updates. We are recommending 15K to support continued work on our websites, but will need to have a conversation how to support HEAR and HISP in the future.
 - iii. New proposal from HBIN. Trying to roll out a project of online reporting of pest species and has support from DOA PPC and PQ to develop this, which will support the database staff, travel to work with DOA, and time for monitoring the site. Also going to include notification of agencies when new pests are developed. We are recommending not funding a new web app that was included in the proposal.
 - iv. We are recommending 5K for the farmer workshops. Not sure how many people can be reached with this reduced amount. Is this still possible with 5K?
 - 1. Duane: we will have to get with Oahu RCD to figure out how we will make it work.
 - v. CCH submitted proposal about ungulate reports. The reports are meant to be 50 pages and we will fund 1K for just the legislature reports and outreach
 - vi. Aquatics proposal. Valuable to have an outreach person focused on AIS, so we have requested that they work with outreach specialists to develop a strategic work plan. She has met with Jackie to begin that process.
 - vii. 200K is a small expenditure to make sure that you have public support. It is what drives so many things. They call legislators, they work at county fairs to reach people, so I would suggest that they are as important as people in the field and we need to figure out how to increase this amount.
 - viii. Teya: it has been more in the past?
 - ix. Christy: yes, but EPWG is where we are giving up some of the funds. We are hoping that allowing leeway between the ISCs it will get evened out a bit.
 - x. Josh: there used to be more funds in outreach, but this is a bit of an increase from last year.
- c. Prevention WG (Carol)
 - i. We didn't have many proposals this year.

- ii. Hopefully AIS can work with number that is recommended
- iii. For HAL, we have tried to get other funding for our projects, so we were able to get federal funding for bee projects this year. We want to figure out how to get HAL onto other sources of funding. We have to get some of these guys into programmatic funding, for AIS stuff too for DAR. How to get them into the civil service grid, fitting into a classification system. We may get techs as civil service and then just fund Cas with soft money.
- iv. Prevention is small, not because we aren't doing the work but because we managed to get it into a stable source of funding. Got federal matches for biocontrol. We need to create a system with the ISCs for biosecurity. We have only been plugging the leaks for the past 3-5 years.

5. Budget discussion

- a. Leo: Attended POWG and saw the process. I want to thank the chairs for working to make recommendations for a balanced budget. Open it up to discussion to work on amounts and change things around.
- b. Josh: HEAR project—could transfer some of those duties to HBIN. WRA recommendation is to go from 2 to 1 FTE.
- c. Teya: Is it already known that KRCP can be done as a PCSU project?
- d. Josh: I believe it would just need David Duffy's approval.
- e. Teya: But is that against the eligibility requirements in the call for proposals? (i.e., proposals were supposed to be submitted as PCSU projects or government projects).
- f. Josh: We can give an exception if we want.
- g. Christy: (Regarding HEAR): This would only take Patty part of the year, and then figure out how to work on website updates in the future. This is something the ISCs need to decide as well. Our websites are on HBIN's servers. Elizabeth historically had access to our websites and no reason that she isn't tasked with updates to HISP, but it has been a legacy HEAR function. Could eventually migrate HISP to WordPress so ISC outreach can manage. Need to move HEAR site to UH server and then reach out to people to get funding for functions of HEAR.
- h. Rachel: thank you for doing FTE calculations for ISCs. Just so everyone knows, this is not all of our core funding. For OISC, our proposal assumed we would need to raise more funds. The proposal didn't cover all of the FTE needed. Want to also comment on outreach. We went without a dedicated outreach person, there is a demand for outreach in the public. People want the information. We have a need to go out and educate people.
- i. Keren: If KISC was cut heavily, I would cut field before outreach, because we can engage 40,000 people on Kauai through outreach. Agree that this is inadequate overall.
- j. Teya: Some of the functions discussed here would make sense folding into the state agencies. The deer work would really make sense as DLNR. We are getting a coordinator to address a long-standing problem on Maui that has

now moved to BI. Why is an ad hoc group coming up with a plan to manage a game species? So hopefully they will be taken up by DLNR. But other functions, it is good to keep separate to get matching funds like the ISCs do.

- k. Carol: There used to be game management plans. It has always been a balancing act between what people want as game and what they want as controlled import. We will keep looking for federal opportunities to fund ants. Maybe this session we can put a baseline out this session to talk about the need and what is not being covered.
- l. Josh: Regarding ideal funding amounts, refer to the graph that was made and contact me if I didn't cover everything. I plan to present this to HISC to show what we actually need to do the work.
- m. Teya: Is there any intent for this group to meet again to talk about resources?
- n. Josh: There is a goal to move in that direction, whether it is HISC support staff or the Resources WG that convenes those meetings. We are grateful to DBEDT to chair and moderate this discussion, but whether they want to participate in looking for other funding sources is another order of magnitude in terms of commitment. It will more likely be HISC support staff and should be worked into the strategic plan update.
- o. Christy: a gap analysis was done about what is spent on invasive species and what is needed, Chris Buddenhagen worked on that, so those numbers exist. We should get new numbers and should be part of a standard project by the RWG. The old numbers are pre budget crisis.
- p. Leo: looking at other funding sources, DBEDT and OP, we get 50% of our funding from federal, but we are looking at foundations and are plugged into the Lt. Gov's grant hui. I could certainly bring some of that information. We have quarterly meetings at the LG's office. Can let them know this is an area with need.
- q. Josh: I don't know if HISC can apply for federal grants and incorporate it as part of budget cycle.
- r. Christy: to make case for HISC in first place was that funds would be matched by non-state funds. 2:1 promise when HISC was first created. We should report our match so the state knows they aren't the only ones supporting.
- s. Teya: while I greatly appreciate the offer of HISC staff to take on some of that, I am feeling pretty urgent and it's true for the other ISCs. We are looking at potential loss of 12-15 positions. There is a benefit to bring more people together to look at possible funding sources, instead of relying on HISC staff who have a lot on their plate. I would like to see the continued functioning of resources working group to find more resources. A broader, more inclusive group. I hope that there is a plan for the next meeting by end of this meeting.
- t. Rachel: maybe setting up a different structure where there is a deputy chair so that we can move that discussion forward. Maybe someone from UH Foundation or TNC who has more skills with fundraising. Public-private initiative.

- u. Josh: The suggestion is that we would partner with private foundation who would commit funding and HISC would coordinate support of projects.
- v. Rachel: We need to look at increasing public funds, but we also need to look at private foundations.
- w. Carol: How are federal funding opportunities going?
- x. Domingo: Not getting any better; belt tightening in the office.
- y. Josh: I like the idea of having RWG as a forum for that discussion, if everyone is bringing things to table.
- z. Kate: Who else would we want to invite?
- aa. Teya: Legislators.
- bb. Josh: Might be better to go that route than departmental.
- cc. Teya: My understanding is current process of HISC funding is DLNR makes decision on how much is given to HISC.
- dd. Josh: HISC doesn't currently have input on the amount of funding we receive from DLNR. DLNR doesn't request funding specifically for the HISC (i.e. general funds). The total amount for NARF is dictated by conveyance tax revenues, and then DOFAW makes a discretionary decision regarding how much funding will go to the HISC.
- ee. Teya: Why is the council not engaged in that process? Could add 200K to each agency's budget to go to HISC.
- ff. Rachel: We need to have someone from DLNR and HAWP to advocate for our needs too, without interfering.
- gg. Josh: I talked to Emma Yuen regarding the Watershed Initiative RFP, and they were surprised that they didn't get more ISC requests. But my sense was that there wasn't a lot of funding this year and that ISC requests would take away core funding for Watershed Partnerships, which would explain why the ISCs weren't requesting a lot of funding from that RFP this year. Emma still hopes that the RFP will function as collaborative route combining local Watershed Partnerships, DOFAW, and ISCs.
- hh. Christy: That direction needs to be more clear in the future.
- ii. Keren: As the initiative was written, it prioritizes certain areas, which we don't work in.
- jj. Josh: At a future budget discussion it would be great to have Guy there, and Paul, perhaps William, Lisa, Josh Stanboro.
- kk. Carol: Should first figure out what are the priorities and how we want to make our request.
- ll. Leo: I would suggest keeping those legislators engaged.
- mm. Christy: we will need to reengage folks after election. We still need to talk to watershed folks as soon as possible. How about morning/afternoon? Talk to watersheds in morning and HCF and other grant agencies in the afternoon? Could tap into rural employment programs.
- nn. **It is agreed that attendees should send suggestions to Josh on who should be at the table. Will shoot for late September.**
- oo. It is agreed that the recommended budget will be taken into the HISC meeting.

- pp. Paul: The DOFAW general fund budget situation remains pretty much the same, only 10K reduction from last year. Looking at the same level of funding. In the next year there might be wiggle room, part of that is we have a contingency pot. So same level of support we gave out last year, we should be able to give out this year.
- qq. Josh: last year it was about 340K in general funding. We got 300K out the door and reserved about \$40K for emergencies. This year those funds will probably be used to offset the ISCs, as they are looking at laying off the most staff.
- rr. Keren: Is it likely that it will cap as the same as last year or what is the wiggle room?
- ss. Paul: Mainly the funds are stable.
- tt. Teya: What about special land development funds? Watershed funds?
- uu. Paul: We had a meeting on how we are going to implement or allocate those budgets. The \$2.5M "bump" is going to be taken off top and go into competitive package for watersheds. We need more boost out of housing sales, if there is a shortage, the Chair said they will beat the bushes to make the difference for the watershed initiative.
- vv. Teya: We identified the need for invasive species funding as \$10M, do you think there is a possibility of raising the HISC funding?
- ww. **Paul: This should be one of the programs for which we restore the general funds that were cut, and continue to look for the appropriate dedicated funding source.**
- xx. Josh: This could happen in this upcoming legislative session.
- yy. Paul: Yes, we should try to get the general funds restored. Legacy Land funds (\$400K) expire next year.
- zz. Rachel: When you say restore general funds...does that mean \$2M + NARF?
- aaa. Paul: We need to find a dedicated funding source.
6. Meeting is adjourned.