

GAME MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMISSION MEETING

DATE: March 15, 2018
TIME: 9:00 AM
PLACE: Conference Rooms A, B, & C, State Building, 75 Aupuni Street, Hilo, HI 96720
PURPOSE: Game Management Advisory Commission Meeting (#5)

MINUTES

ITEM 1. Call to order, introductions of members, staff, and visitors; request for move-ups on the agenda.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Lori Buchanan—Molokai (Vice Chair)
Robert Cremer—Kauai
Josiah Jury—Oahu
Ryan Kohatsu—East Hawaii
Stanley Ruidas—Lanai
Jon Sabati—West Hawaii (Chair)
David Smith—Department of Forestry and Wildlife
Nancy Timko—Oahu

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

Jefferey DeRego—Maui

STAFF (DOFAW):

Steve Bergfield
Jim Cogswell
Ian Cole
Shane De Mattos
Lindsey Ibara
Dr. Shaya Honarvar
Raymond McGuire
John Medeiros
Joey Mello
Jason Misaki
Dietra Myers-Tremblay
Jason Omick
Kaleohone Roback
Kanalū Sproat
Sarah Way
Nicholas Vargas

VISITORS:

Aaron Brown

Bob Duerr

Richard Hoeflinger

Brian Ley

Stanley Mendal

Dennis "Fresh" Onishi (Hawaii County Councilman)

Tony Sylvester

Dwayne Yoshina

Tom Lodge

Chair Sabati asks if there are any move-up requests. There are none.

ITEM 2. Action Required: Approval of minutes from Jan. 17, 2018 GMAC meeting.

Comm. Buchanan: Mr. Chair, I wanted to go over the minutes and I wanted to make sure all the commission members had a copy of the minutes from staff. No?

Comm. Smith: I don't remember seeing them. Did they get emailed? They got emailed? Oh. I get a million emails. Sorry, I miss a bunch.

Comm. Buchanan: Okay, that's all right. Shaya printed it. It was about 45 pages long. Kudos to staff for pretty much taking verbatim minutes, which I love. I did want to make some corrections to the agenda and some clarifications. I was not present at that meeting, so I appreciated the minutes. Thank you,

Richard Hoeflinger (public): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask: how does the public get access to what is a public document?

Comm. Smith: We post the minutes after, yeah? I don't think we post draft minutes.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): Where would we go to get that information?

Comm. Smith: It was probably posted on the website. What does the commission do?

Comm. Buchanan: Mr. Chair, can I answer that question? It's only in draft. After it's approved by this commission, it will be posted online and you can print out a copy.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): Where would it be posted?

Comm. Buchanan: Shaya, where would it be posted?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): We're in the process of creating a section on the DLNR website, just like all the other commissions that we have. Once the minutes are approved, then we can post them there. However, if you would like to see the draft minutes, I believe that's also possible, and you can contact me. We have a couple of ways you can sign up to receive the agenda: we have the sign-up sheets up there, where you can sign up and I will send you the agenda, and then for the minutes you can personally contact me and then I'll send you the draft minutes. I can do that within 30 days after the meeting, once the minutes are done. We also have the state Calendar of Events. If you go on there and you type in "Game Management Advisory Commission," then the meeting will come up—not every meeting—but the upcoming meeting will come up, and then you can download the agenda from there. By law, we have to post the agenda six calendar days before the meeting, and we do that. We also have a sign-up mailing list that's on our website (DOFAW- Hunting). If you go there and you sign up to our

mailing list, I will send every single hunting announcement, our newsletters, and the date and time of the GMAC meeting, too, every time it comes up.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): That will be a result of this sign-up sheet?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): It will not be a result of this. This is only to get the agenda. I cannot mix the two. So, if you would like to have the other one, you have to go online and you push a button and put your name in the box.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): It seems to me that the minutes ought to be available by a link on the DLNR website or somewhere.

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): I agree with you. I'm in the process of creating that.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Buchanan makes a motion to defer ITEM 2 until the end of the meeting. Commissioner Kohatsu seconds. There are no objections. Motion carries.

ITEM 3. Action Required: Form a permitted Interaction Group to start working on internal policies, practices and procedures for state GMAC. During this meeting, the members will be chosen (less than a quorum) and the scope of the investigation will be defined.

Chair Sabati: Do I have any comments from the commissioners?

Comm. Buchanan: Mr. Chair, I think that was my item. I asked for it to be on the agenda, because I think under statute we are allowed to do that, and I think it's very important for this new board to have some structure, because we're going to change, and the commissioners will change on the board. It's going to be a document to follow on the proper procedures, such as: if the Chair is not here, the Vice Chair runs the meeting; if the Vice Chair is not here, then we can ask or assign membership to run the meeting—those types of policies and procedures. We don't have any right now, and we're going to start running into issues as we go along if we don't have a structure. So, under the law, we're allowed to form a permitted Interaction Group, so more than two commissioners can talk to each other on this group. That is why this is listed as an action item. That was me, putting this on the agenda, and I'm hoping you guys can support this, and I'll be one of the members who serves on that permitted Interaction Group.

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): I just want to point out that the number of members has to be less than quorum, so only up to four people.

Commissioners Buchanan, Jury, Kohatsu, and Ruidas volunteer to serve on this permitted Interaction Group.

Comm. Buchanan: You might want to take public testimony on ITEM 3.

Chair Sabati: Do we have anybody who would like to make a comment or testify on ITEM 3, on the Interaction Group? None? Thank you.

Tony Sylvester (public): I have a question. Do you guys have counsel? Like Ige's office—how on the game commission, you have to have someone with corporate counsel, as legal representation?

Chair Sabati: Yes, we do.

Tony Sylvester (public): Well, where is that person today?

Comm. Buchanan: Well, we do have our administrator here.

Comm. Smith: I am not counsel. I'm a member of the commission. I am not an attorney.

Comm. Buchanan: And Shaya is our secretary. So, they're taking the minutes.

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): Sarah is actually taking the minutes, and I just assist with the meeting.

Commissioner Buchanan makes a motion to form a permitted Interaction Group to start working on internal policies, practices and procedures for the state game commission. Commissioner Kohatsu seconds. All in favor. Motion carries.

ITEM 4. Action Required: A letter to submit to the Board of Land and Natural Resources regarding the Commission's advice regarding the Waianae mountains aerial shooting for the control of feral goats.

Chair Sabati: Josiah, can you lead on this?

Comm. Jury: Yes, thank you, Chair. This is the item from Oahu. This has been an ongoing concern of the public on Oahu, and it's been on many agenda items. After reviewing everything, and having the district representatives be involved with the issue and the concerns of the community, I feel like we kind of concluded with this letter—and a lot of you have the letter and have read the letter—and after gathering all the information on Oahu from the people, and from the senators and representatives, I feel that it's important that we move this letter through, to support and present it to the BLNR, if the commission approves. I'll be able to take any questions regarding the letter and what the issue is.

Comm. Buchanan: We never opened for public testimony—but Mr. Chair, I have a question for Commissioner Jury. I don't know if everybody has a copy of the letter, so would you want to read it out loud into the record, and then we can open for testimony?

Comm. Jury: Okay. Bear with me now:

"To: The Board of Land and Natural Resources

From: The Hawaii State Game Commission

Regarding the Waianae Mountain Aerial Shooting Project

Dear Board Members,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide advice regarding the Waianae mountain aerial shoot plan. The first GMAC meeting was held in Honolulu, Hawaii on June 19, 2017. At the meeting, DOFAW staff presented the Waianae Aerial Shoot Plan for the control of feral goats in the Waianae and Makaha mountains. Commissioners, as well as members of the public, had raised several questions and concerns about the project. At the GMAC's next meeting, held on August 17, 2017, commissioners and members of the public had more questions and concerns about the aerial shoot plan. It was duly noted that for many years, recreational hunters—as well as cultural practitioners—opposed using aerial shooting from a helicopter as a management tool to control feral ungulates, specifically in the project for goats. Much of that time at the August 17, 2017 meeting was spent discussing it. DOFAW staff in attendance conveyed that they had been doing outreach in affected communities, but they have acknowledged that more engagement with the community was needed. Several suggestions to improve communication with affected people were given to DOFAW staff by commissioners and members of the public. DOFAW Administrator David Smith suggested the commissioners meet with their island's DOFAW staff to address commissioners' concerns. The commission appreciated his directive. At the meeting of August

2017, based on hours of testimony from the public and staff reports, commissioners concluded that subsistent and valid concerns still needed to be answered such as: is the project violating law with reference to native Hawaiian gathering rights; is affected people's right to due process being violated; what is the long-term management plan for aerial shooting in the Waianae and Makaha mountains? Commissioners voted to transmit a letter to the Board of Land and Natural Resources requesting that DOFAW put a hold on the Waianae aerial shoot plan for the purpose of reviewing DOFAW's policy and gathering more data and public feedback. Commissioners also voted to convey a meeting to specifically address DOFAW's aerial shooting policy. This later action to form a committee was not done after receiving advice to convey a formal Interaction Group at the future meeting. In days following the August 2017 meeting, DOFAW moved forward with the aerial shooting of goats from a helicopter in Waianae despite the commission's concern and recommendation. This was viewed by the commission as DOFAW's being disingenuous on our verbal agreements to work collaboratively. DOFAW apologized for the oversight and reiterated their commitment to meet commissioners' concerns by individual island staffers. Commissioners believe that the aerial shoot would cease while DOFAW and the GMAC worked on suggestions in the letter to the Board. However, DOFAW continued aerial shooting, sparking additional anger in the Waianae and the Makaha communities. Legislative Representative Andria Tupola, District 44, and Representative Cedric Gates, District 43, both hosted community meetings, and after meeting with DOFAW staff, made amendments to their plan. Ultimately at the last community meeting—which was eight so far that DOFAW has attended—Representative Tupola suggested starting all over again, as a suggestion. Therefore, in order for the GMAC to carry out its duties, stipulated in HB1041 with reference to assist the Department on policies, plans and procedures relating to the control of game mammals, including aerial shooting activities, by the Department and its contractors, the Hawaii State Game Commission strongly recommends and advises the Board of Land and Natural Resources to order an immediate stop to using the aerial shoot out of a helicopter as a management tool to control feral goats in the Waianae and Makaha mountain range. In addition, the commission would like to work collaboratively with DOFAW to create a game and wildlife management plan for those regions or districts throughout an open and transparent process of collaboration with affected persons. Thank you for your consideration, and we look forward to working together to enhance and maintain sustainable public hunting opportunities while preserving Hawaii's unique ecosystem.

Sincerely,

Josiah Jury, Oahu Representative, and Jon Sabati, Chair and Hawaii Representative”

Comm. Buchanan: Commissioner Jury? I would suggest one small amendment. It's on page two—when you talk about Representative Andria Tupola, it says, “ultimately at the last community meeting.” I would suggest you insert the date of that meeting, which was recent, yeah?

Comm. Jury: Yeah. It was last week, Wednesday.

Comm. Buchanan: Okay. So, I would suggest you insert that date, so if we move to vote on this, it's with the amendment to insert the date after it says, “and ultimately at the last community meeting”—there's been eight so far—to put the date, March 7th, 2018. Would you also suggest that the record shows twice that there's a reference to an Exhibit One? Exhibit One would be the first letter that we wrote.

Comm. Jury: Correct. “Exhibit One, let it be shown that it is the first letter that was written directly to the BLNR.” Are there any other commissioners who have any suggestions, or amendments, or any questions about the letter?

Chair Sabati: Okay, I’d like to open this to the public.

Tom Lodge (public): Back when the commission was being discussed—this is between DLNR and Tony, myself, and other members of HNRA—part of the discussion in the creation of the bill, 1041, was the commission’s responsibility for aerial eradication. Aerial eradication was a really big issue for us at the time. House Bill 0799, I think it was—the state thought that aerial eradication was done illegally, and they needed to change the law that would allow them to do that. So, for thirty years or so, they’ve been doing it. I get to that in HRS. 22:15 Part of that agreement in 1041, though, was that the commission would be involved in any discussion of aerial eradication anywhere in the state. So, I’m surprised that that eradication after the commission was already formed even went forward to begin with, and I’m hoping that this change will be forthcoming that you’re suggesting—that DLNR takes it seriously, that you guys do have a job to do, and that you do represent the people who are involved in our community. So, I applaud this move, but I’m hoping that DLNR will take this seriously.

Chair Sabati: Thank you. Anybody else?

Dietra Myers-Tremblay (DOFAW): I just want clarification. You refer to HB1041, and I’m just curious: what year is that from? Because when I looked it up, it’s not the bill that actually established the statute, that established GMAC. We were curious about some of the language you said—“assisting the Department on policy and plans”—because that language I don’t believe is actually in the statute that established the commission. So, I would just make sure you’re taking the actual language from the statute, because I think you’re referring to this bill that didn’t even pass.

Comm. Jury: I understand. I’m trying to look for it right now.

Tony Sylvester (public): Well, I wrote the bill that’s in there.

Dietra Myers-Tremblay (DOFAW): Oh, okay. But this 1041, but that’s not the bill that—

Tony Sylvester (public): That’s what we lobbied for. I don’t know where this changed, somewhere along the line.

Comm. Buchanan: Hang on, hang on. I’m sorry. Mr. Chair, the recorder cannot distinguish who is speaking. When they do the minutes—and I’m reading it—I need to know who said what, so please state for the record who you are before you speak. And then it is public testimony—Tony, you’re welcome to stand up after. Mr. Chair, I have a question then for Dietra. Are you aware of that type of language anywhere now, in statute?

Dietra Myers-Tremblay (DOFAW): I’m looking at it right now. I just want to make sure that it matches, because the bill that you’re referring to didn’t even pass. Bill 1041 in 2015.

Chair Sabati: Do we have any more public testimony on this letter? That put a stop to that. Questions?

Comm. Jury: Chair, I want to say that her testimony is noted, and we will make sure when reporting that bill, that we use the most updated version of the quote to reflect what was actually said. That’s what you’re saying, right?

Dietra Myers-Tremblay (DOFAW): Go to statute, yes.

Comm. Jury: Thank you.

Comm. Buchanan: Okay. Mr. Chair, in the letter—let’s turn to the second page, because I do not want to defer this. I’d like to support our Oahu commissioner because, as you can see, this has been very long,

and arduous, and ongoing for the community, so to put this off any further would be disrespectful. I would not want to do that to them. So, let's work through this right now, let's take a minute. Dietra, if you can maybe pull up the actual bill itself?

Dietra Myers-Tremblay (DOFAW): I'm pulling up the statute right now.

Comm. Buchanan: Okay, thank you. On the second page, where it says "therefore" and it's referencing the 1041, it says, "therefore in order for the GMAC to carry out its duties stipulated in 1041 with reference to"—and then it quotes—"assist the Department on policies, plans and procedures related to the control of game mammals, including aerial shooting activities by the Department and its contractors," I would suggest striking "including aerial shooting activities by the Department and its contractors," because that's where the contention is, and that's where you were saying that that never passed. And right now, to me that is moot.

Tony Sylvester (public): May I speak on that? I'm Tony Sylvester, and I wrote the bill. Robert Cremer, Tom, and myself had flown in to do our conversation when we put that in there, and that was stipulated to be in there—it was a deputy chair at that time that was working with us, too, so I would be quite shocked if that was removed somewhere between the bill reaching its final destination, I guess, after the governor signed it.

Comm. Buchanan: Wouldn't be surprising, though, yeah?

Tony Sylvester (public): Yeah. I would like you guys to look for it, I'm very interested in that.

Dietra Myers-Tremblay (DOFAW): I'm going to look it up right now. It is in there. What I suggest you to do is refer to the statute, section 183D-4.5. And the quote, the actual quote, is correct.

Comm. Buchanan: So, Mr. Chair, with the amendment in the fourth paragraph, first line, "in order for GMAC to carry out its duty stipulated in"—strike HB1041, insert 183D-4.5—and that might be the only needed correction. Is that good with you, Dietra?

Dietra Myers-Tremblay (DOFAW): Yes. And just another suggestion: whenever you're referring to a bill, make sure to put in parentheses what year that's from, because you just don't know what year to go to look at if it's the same bill number.

Comm. Buchanan: And that would be 2015?

Dietra Myers-Tremblay (DOFAW): So, I'd have to look up the bill number, but this was passed in... 2016?

Comm. Jury: I think it's 2016.

Dietra Myers-Tremblay (DOFAW): But if you refer to statute, then you don't need to put that.

Comm. Buchanan: Do we need to put HRS 183D-4.5?

Dietra Myers-Tremblay (DOFAW): Yes. Those are my comments.

Chair Sabati: Do we have any more public testimony?

Bob Duerr (public): Hawaii Fishing News. Question: are we talking about a house bill or about HRS?

Chair Sabati: HRS. Okay, if there's no other testimony, I will be closing it. Commissioners, a motion?

Commissioner Buchanan makes a motion to submit the letter that was read into the minutes to the Board of Land and Natural Resources regarding the commission's advice regarding the Waianae mountains aerial shooting for the control of feral goats, with three amendments: 1) on page two, paragraph three, say "ultimately at the last community meeting on March 7, 2018;" 2) on page two, paragraph four, say "therefore in order for GMAC to carry out its duty stipulated in HRS 183D-4.5"—and to insert the year; 3) clarify on pages one and two that the letter clearly alludes to Exhibit One, which is

the first letter sent to BLNR in an earlier meeting. Commissioner Kohatsu seconds. All in favor, except Commissioner Smith, who opposes. Motion carries.

ITEM 5. Updates on hunting-related legislative bills and a discussion of prohibiting wanton waste of game species taken off state land through rule-making or legislation.

Comm. Buchanan: That would be staff, yeah? Staff?

Dietra Myers-Tremblay (DOFAW): Hi. I used to work for the legislature for a drafting agency, so that is why I pay close attention to these things. In regard to bills relating to hunting that are still alive: there's SB2077, and that authorizes the Department of Land and Natural Resources to enter into the Interstate Wildlife Violator Compact for permit and financial assistance in the enforcement of wildlife laws. That's still alive. All other bills regarding apprentice hunting, and then some bills that got carried over from last year—they all died. The apprentice hunting license bill that made it the furthest—or was actually heard—was HB1970, and that was heard by the House, Water and Land. It then passed over to Judiciary, and Judiciary did not carry it. And it had a triple referral, so Finance would have heard it after that. So, it passed away, unfortunately. And then there's a couple resolutions that are introduced: there's two that are urging the Department of Land and Natural Resources to work with local hunters to accommodate traditional and customary native Hawaiian hunting practices, and change its policies based on the concerns of local hunters. And then there's a couple other resolutions, and both of those are requesting the Department of Land and Natural Resources, Division of Forestry and Wildlife to offer free online hunter education courses or accept the completion of certain online hunter education courses and partial satisfaction of those requirements to obtain a hunting license. Do you have any questions?

Tom Lodge (public): The hunter education program right now allows online certification. I don't understand this bill.

Dietra Myers-Tremblay (DOFAW): Well, that's a resolution.

Tom Lodge (public): All right, I don't even understand that. Sometimes that happens, okay.

Dietra Myers-Tremblay (DOFAW): Yes. Sometimes, that happens.

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): It's actually not free. I believe you have to pay about \$20 to take the online course. There's a lot of people who want to take it online.

Tom Lodge (public): Many states have like a \$20 to \$30 fee to get their certificate. You can do the course for free, but to get the certificate, you've got to volunteer or whatever it might be.

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): So, there's an online portion, and then you have to take four hours in-person. So, that online one, you still have to pay for it.

Comm. Cremer: I have a question. What is the reason for our course, if you already took an online class, what is the portion of that four hours? Maybe Tom could answer that, or you, or—

Comm. Kohatsu: Is somebody from Hunter Ed here?

Comm. Buchanan: Mr. Chair, you would have to ask the introducer of the resolution, because I don't think staff was the introducer of the resolution.

Dietra Myers-Tremblay (DOFAW): Correct. So, this year, the Division of Forestry and Wildlife did not introduce any bills. We can propose them to the chair, the chair then proposes them to the governor, and he can put them into the admin package, so we have that option. But we didn't propose anything, I just want to clarify that.

Comm. Cremer: My question was, what does that four-hour portion consist of?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): So—I'm not speaking for Andrew Choy, the Hunter Ed Program Manager—but my understanding is, the online portion is very basic. People on the mainland designed that and it talks about all the basic stuff, and the four hours speak mainly about Hawaii-related situations that a hunter needs to know while hunting in Hawaii. That was my understanding, but that's a good question.

Comm. Cremer: Okay, my question to Andrew—maybe I'll email him—is, if we could make that online course closer to Hawaii so the person can just go in and take the test in front of the hunter education people, instead of being there for another four hours. What's the purpose of having an online course where you've still got to go there for four more hours, when we can have an online course where you go in, take your test, they correct the test, and you're done? Thanks, Shaya.

Comm. Ruidas: Cremer, maybe that's to prevent someone else from taking the test and showing up?

Comm. Cremer: No, I mean they're going to take the test at the hunter ed class, so they are not going to take the test online.

Comm. Timko: There are states that provide the online hunting classes, but also require a field test, so even after they pass the online test—I believe it's Oregon—they actually have to go and do a field test.

Comm. Buchanan: Dietra, you just gave us an update on SB2077, the Interstate Violator Compact? So, I would need to go online—we would all need to go online—and respond to that, since it looks like it's moving through—and I would have to go in and put in testimony to say, "Where's the due process for native Hawaiians within the Interstate Violator Compact?" Because I think it's unclear. Because it's a partnership, it's interstate, it would be—what, federal, state? I don't know how Hawaiians would fare within that, since their rights are distinguishable from the general public through the constitution.

Dietra Myers-Tremblay (DOFAW): Just to let you know: that passed the Senate, crossed over to the House—it has a triple referral—and it went through its first committee, Water and Land. So, it is now at Judiciary. Definitely go online, and look at the measure's status, and look at the most up-to-date bill. I find the website to be pretty easy to use.

Comm. Buchanan: Thank you. Mr. Chair?

Chair Sabati: Open to the public.

Tom Lodge (public): I believe every state that does online requires a field day for state-specific. Like, we have rules—our laws and regulations here are different than what they might be in Montana, and what have you. You need to have some idea what's going on in your state, part of the state-specific stuff. And with the exception of Texas, every state—in Texas, anybody under 17 requires a four-hour class. Otherwise, if you're over 17 in Texas, you can do an online thing and go straight through.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): Just go to the state of Texas, take the exam, and be done with it—you don't go anywhere. And it's absurd to have an online course and to have to drag your butt down somewhere to take an exam. That just says, "We don't trust you, you're going to cheat." That's the attitude Hawaii has in many of their rules and regulations. There's no trust in the people.

Comm. Kohatsu: Can I add to that discussion? I know when I hunt in other states, it is required of me to carry my hunter education certificate. You can buy the license even without it, but if you don't have the hunter ed certificate and the award and an enforcement officer stops you, you are in violation of some other state laws in other states. So, I believe that is how they enforce the—how we check someone coming in to a warm-body test. We check their ID because it's a legal document. In other states, they sell the license even though they haven't checked you on that, but if they were to ever check in the field,

you would have to produce these documents—they're required. That's another opportunity. So, why we wouldn't need a warm body here is, there's opportunities for other checks that other people use.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): Basically, how people existed before there was this hunter education.

Chair Sabati: Okay, moving on. Wanton waste of game species. Open for discussion.

Tom Lodge (public): In the late 90's, we submitted wanton waste bills. The DLNR resisted every one of our efforts in passing those bills, because it would cause extra effort on their part to haul the game out and distribute it to people. Whatever their reasoning was, the DLNR has resisted this all the way down the line. And wanton waste is the rule in pretty much every other state. You just can't shoot something, leave it there, and waste it. We support wanton waste bills, encourage ways to deal with handling game—that's what game management's about. I'm not for wanton waste, I'm for a bill that prevents wanton waste.

Chair Sabati: Any other public comment?

Bob Duerr (public): Question. Is there any statistics on how much poundage and what species the state has actually wasted?

Chair Sabati: Not to my knowledge, but we can refer to staff. Joey, you have any idea? None? No data's been kept, right?

Tony Sylvester (public): There should be data on the amount of sheep on Mauna Kea that's been eradicated, I've seen that in the past—the actual carcasses, how much is taken from hunting and from the eradication.

Comm. Buchanan: Mr. Chair, since you had that question from the public, could we get Big Island's staff to look if there's information on that? And then get Mr. Duerr's contact, and maybe they can forward the information to him?

Chair Sabati: According to him, he said all the information is carcass count. Is that correct? The only data available is carcass count for the eradication?

Richard Hoeflinger (public): I have that information; the information is available. You can do what I did, which is go through the semi-annual reports to the federal court: if you go through all 73 of those reports, you can put together the story on the number of animals that were removed from Mauna Kea since 1980, and you can subtract—you can get the numbers that were taken from public hunting, and the numbers that were taken from staff and contract shooting. The numbers are: 22,000+ animals in total were taken from the mountain, and about half of those were taken through public hunting. So, half of 22,000 is 11,000 animals that were taken by contract and whatever means that DLNR employed to do that. And the majority of those were left to rot.

Chair Sabati: Okay. Thank you. Any other comments or testimony?

Comm. Kohatsu: With that being said, I want to just follow up with this discussion, because this was my agenda item that I personally requested, and it's because of some recent events in the public eye. Hunting is always viewed in the public eye in a certain way, and my intent of including this agenda item was to protect the image of public hunting in the court of public opinion. And recent events with some animals being left on the side of the road and things like that—while they might be taken off of private land or might be somebody else's stuff, it's all speculation. What my intent was—with regard to our public hunting seasons and areas that we already hunt—this waste is not allowable. The opportunities for people to take game on a public state hunt and throw them away, or throw them somewhere else to be put in the public eye and have an incident should not be allowed, and isn't tolerated in any other

state, anyway. So, what I would like is a discussion with the DLNR. How and where do you support: 1) that we don't waste our game that is within our state hunts; and 2) how and where is the proper place to put regulation for wanton waste? Is it an administrative rule, is it statute? Where do we begin? I don't know who to direct that to—DOFAW, maybe administrator—but we can start with: do you support it, not wasting our hunts? I mean, there's public testimony on eradication of this other stuff, that's one thing. But my original intent was stuff that we take on public hunts right now, and we can start there.

Comm. Smith: All right, I think that's good. They're having problems in other states where guys are going out and shooting trophy animals and just leaving them. They're just shooting them to take a picture and they walk away—big grizzly bears, cougars and whatnot—and we definitely oppose that activity. That's something that's going on in both the U.S. and Canada, talking with the wildlife directors there. So, we would oppose any hunting activity that would wantonly waste game.

Comm. Kohatsu: Furthering that discussion, then: saying that you oppose it, I would assume the default is that you support maybe creating a regulation for this? Where would be the proper place to begin?

Comm. Smith: Is that currently illegal? Can you do that, go shoot animals?

Comm. Kohatsu: No, it's not. Like right now, we see it in Lanai. You shoot an ewe to get an either sex tag. It's 9:00 the morning—these animals aren't rotten yet—these guys would come in, shoot the ewe, and throw it right in the dumpster at the DOFAW office—whole bodies, right inside of there. I saw it myself, and it's totally legal right now. It's crazy, but it is legal. So, where would we begin that process of maybe prohibiting those kinds of actions?

Comm. Smith: Right. I'm not a legislative expert, but I guess you'd have to get a bill submitted by the legislature to make it illegal—add it to the game rules, maybe 123? I don't know.

Comm. Cremer: For me, I think it's absurd that we don't have a wanton waste law in effect, and it's more absurd that you guys have always busted down when it goes to legislature. When you look at animals being wasted, it's a shame. People are out there trying to subsidize their living, already having a hard time, because areas are getting closed off, because of fencing and all that, and now we have to worry about what is getting wasted on our land. We need to have a wanton waste law in effect for Hawaii—I don't care what anybody says. In Alaska, you shoot an animal, you need to tag that animal, mark it on a GPS, and send it in as soon as you reach telephone service. Enforcement flies there with a helicopter, and checks what you got. There's no way of getting away from it, and I don't see how we cannot do that here. Majority of the states do it.

Comm. Smith: Really? Wait, wait. Every time you tag an animal, enforcement flies out with a helicopter to check you? I find that hard to believe.

Comm. Cremer: The moose and the big game.

Comm. Kohatsu: Not all the time, but if they were to catch you—

Comm. Smith: That would be very expensive.

Comm. Cremer: But think about this: if you tag an animal, you send in a GPS, what are you going to do? You're going to make sure you're not going to waste it, yeah? There's a difference now. I'm held to a standard, I've got to tag the animal.

Comm. Smith: I think part of the thing is, you've got to figure out what it is you're trying to accomplish. People that are hunting are not just shooting animals and leaving them, or, like you say, the blatant waste—I'm not sure what the deal is, what you have to do—trade in ammo, get another tag?

Comm. Kohatsu: That was just a sample. There was an incentive drawn—it was a mix of population management and the popular hunt of the either sex tag. But in any case, what I was looking for in this discussion was a yes or no commitment from the Department on beginning the discussion to create this wanton waste regulation. Is that a yes or a no?

Comm. Smith: I mean, yes, we can discuss it. I don't know what you're trying to accomplish. What specifically is the problem we're trying to fix? I don't like just throwing new laws out there.

Comm. Kohatsu: The problem we're trying to fix is preventing the waste—that's one, right? If we agree that that is unacceptable, let's have that commitment. Then two: it's a mitigation measure of protecting the image of public hunting in the public eye, because we do have these incidents happen. It'd be nearsighted—it'd be foolish of us not to address this, considering everybody else does. What I need—or what I feel the commission needs, and the hunters that we serve—is just a commitment from the Department that, “Hey, we'll start this discussion. Yes, we agree that the waste of game species within our public hunts is unacceptable and that we will be open to that.” Up until this point we've had a history of trying to do this. Yes, it's modelled with all kinds of different people's opinions and whatever, right? But at the minimum, we do something, is all I'm asking, and whether we could have that kind of commitment, or at least the start—and on the record, to some degree, because the record before is just that we don't support it. “Why?” “Oh, because we've got to aerial shoot and leave them there,” that kind of stuff. On a personal level, I don't care about that. All I care about, right now, at the minimum, is what we do as hunters. So, could we have that?

Comm. Smith: Well, we'd have to see the legislation before we'd say we support it. If it addresses hunters not wasting game that they shoot in lawful public hunt, yeah, we would support that for sure.

Chair Sabati: May I make a comment? Adding to what Ryan said: I think another view is, I'm trying to make a distinction between hunters and poachers. On the west side, we have problems with poachers. What they do is, they take the animal, but they only take the trophy and leave the carcass. But when people see that, they blame hunters. So, this also helps educate the communities, saying, “Hey, a poacher did this.” If a hunter did it, then you face the full force of the law, because he was breaking the law. There needs to be a distinction. The hunters who buy licenses—they take hunter ed, they follow the rules and regulations, and are getting tired of being lumped into this one thing. Everything's blamed on the hunters. So, this wanton waste law kind of helps educate, and then hunters who are on the fence who might be tempted, now they know there's consequences. So, I think what Ryan is putting forth is a good point, that we need to start with support from the Department, and we can move forward. I believe then it would have to go through legislation, but just knowing that the Department supports this, and is willing to work on it, I think, is a veritable, positive message.

Comm. Smith: Yeah. Maybe you guys should set up a little committee to look at laws from other states, and pump us some draft language that you could run by us, and maybe we could introduce something.

Chair Sabati: Do you want to add anything else?

Comm. Kohatsu: No.

Comm. Cremer: I wanted to add something. The reason why this rule would work so well is, you would not necessarily have to enforce it. Me as a hunter, I see plenty of waste, but what am I going to do? I can't do anything, there's no law in place to stop this from happening. So, I can see Jack go down the hillside, shoot a deer or a pig, and it's not to his standards—it's a little too thin—he's going to just leave it there, cut off the jaw, get a trophy. I can see it with my own eyes and not do anything. But if the law is

in place, now I can turn this guy in, I've visually seen him—I'll videotape him even if I've got to, because I believe in not wasting. That's why we'd like a law like that.

Chair Sabati: Anybody else in the commission?

Comm. Buchanan: I have some suggestions, but I'm just wondering—I can wait until the end because I might have to make a motion on this—did we take public testimony already on ITEM 5? We did, yeah? Okay. No, we never closed, we're in discussion. But I would have one suggestion: we can make a motion to direct staff, which would probably end up in Jim and Dietra's office, to do a current review of the statutes to see if we have anything that would support the commissioners' concerns, and they can make a report at the next meeting. But I think also—we don't have to wait for the legislature or anybody to make a bill. The bill can come from here, from the commission, and it can be forwarded, I think we have the authority to do that. So, I've heard two things: I've heard Ryan say his concern was public perception of public hunting, and so what we would ask the Department to do is to support a bill to cover public hunting and hunters who are licensed hunters, and if you get caught—wanton waste within a public hunting area and you're doing public hunting—then there would be an enforcement action at that point. So, that's one thing. The other thing is to address people outside that are coming into west side and shooting and taking only the head for a trophy—we call them the young kids that, you know, are disrespectful. But that also affects animal rates, yeah? So, from a humane society perspective, you're not supposed to be treating animals cruelly, yeah? There's ramifications for that, so that's a dual kind of action. So, for this commission, I would hope that we can probably move today—or have a report at the next GMAC meeting addressing this—so we can write up a bill that we want to introduce and ask hunters to support on wanton waste. So, we can move that along.

Comm. Kohatsu: I want to clarify: it may not be statute, it could also be just administrative rule as well. I just don't know.

Comm. Buchanan: Well, that's why we're asking staff to review that, investigate that, and give us a report at the next meeting. It would give us instruction on how we can move forward with a bill. If that's missing information within the hunting rules, then let's get the action administratively for them to start moving forward on supporting something like that.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): I have a question on procedure. Why do you need a bill? Why can't you just do it by administrative rule? You don't need a bill to do that.

Comm. Smith: Yeah, I think administrative rule is probably our best bet. We can look into what the options are, because you have rules for hunting, you have rules for 123 game mammals—I think we're mostly talking about mammals here—so we can look at what the option should be to change those rules to prevent wanton waste in the hunting program.

Tom Lodge (public): The one problem that I have with all of this, just like the aerial eradication: DLNR will do whatever they want. They've imposed all these restrictions, rules, and regulations on ourselves. Right now, we're talking about wanton waste. We're talking about hunters having to behave in a manner respectful to the animal, respectful to the 'aina, and the rest of us. And that is imposed upon us. Ten thousand animals were just wasted, essentially—or at least half of them probably, or more—by DLNR itself. So, where is the value of the land? You're asking us to establish a value for this game—DLNR doesn't give a damn about the game. So, how does that play out with people? And when people say, "Well, follow by example, right?"—we follow DLNR's example. It's not in fenced areas—it's other areas. It's not just pigs and things—it's snares and the rest of it. These animals are not collected, you find these

things and bones on the trail all the time. So, anyway, we need to establish a value of our game, and that's the game management. But wanton waste should apply to everybody—not just us, but it should apply to these guys as well.

Chair Sabati: Thank you.

Comm. Buchanan: I agree.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): I agree with Tom, it's very difficult. I don't support leaving game animals period—I would support whatever Ryan wants—but how do you do that disconnected to what is happening? I mean, 11,000 animals just butchered on the mountain, and we're going to ignore that? Talk about wanton waste—that's wanton waste.

Comm. Kohatsu: If it's a question for me—and just to the public, just because I have to see them all the time and explain things: it's a political process, right?

Richard Hoeflinger (public): The point is DLNR could do something about it.

Comm. Kohatsu: Yeah, they could.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): The point is, they don't do anything. They keep saying, "The court made us do it, the court keeps making us do it." Mamane has nothing to do with what's going on with Palila. So, go back to court and get the federal court order amended, and knock off this aerial shooting stuff.

Chair Sabati: Thank you.

Comm. Kohatsu: It should be an agenda item one day.

Tony Sylvester (public): I've just got one quick question. As far as administrative rule process, that's a selective process, too, isn't it? I mean, sometimes the legislation is faster than the rules?

Comm. Smith: No, I would say not. You'd have a much better chance through the rules.

Tony Sylvester (public): Public hearings...

Comm. Smith: Yeah, but you don't have the kind of—you just introduce a bill and get lucky.

Tony Sylvester (public): The last time, was it seven years, for administrative rule changes?

Comm. Smith: Well, we just lumped too much stuff into it. I think we should go for more frequent, smaller rule amendments, rather than just everybody dogpiling on the thing, you know?

Public: And then a few other things we talked about—administrative rule changes—I'm sure we'll start adding some things, and then—

Comm. Smith: Everybody'll jump in and then it'll take seven years!

Richard Hoeflinger (public): Question for Dave. What is the average time to go through the Chapter 91 process on an administrative rule? When I was on the NARS commission, it seemed like it was about a year. Is that about right?

Comm. Smith: It's about a year. You know, it's not that bad. We have to have public hearings on every island and whatnot. It's a public process.

Comm. Kohatsu: I just want to add: I do understand the public's interest in wanton waste and a general term across even governmental agencies, I do understand that. But what I do also understand is that we have to start somewhere, and if we're going to start somewhere, perhaps it is on a personal level that hunters be the example, and that is my intent of the item.

Chair Sabati: Any other comments?

Comm. Buchanan: Did I hear an action item from Commissioner Kohatsu for further meeting agendas? How about I make a motion—

Comm. Smith: May I ask a question? Do you know how many states have rules regarding wanton waste?

Comm. Kohatsu: Not directly. I couldn't tell you accurately, because I don't know, but I can't name one that doesn't, that's the only thing I can tell you.

Comm. Smith: Because there's been issues lately with guided hunts in Montana, with guys who go out shooting trophy animals and walking away, taking pictures—it's out there—so I have a hard time believing they're able to get away with that and not be prosecuted, so I'm just wondering.

Comm. Kohatsu: Hell, Montana is pretty strict. I know Wyoming next door is pretty strict, too. They outline all the cuts and everything, but I don't know. I guess they just can't catch them all, I don't know.

Unknown (public): Is that public or private land also? Or just public land?

Comm. Kohatsu: Yeah, that's the difference. Hawaii, we're so different, right? In the mainland, the public owns all the resources—if you want to hunt elk even on private land you've got to draw a tag. But here in Hawaii, where the animal sits on private property, it belongs to the landowner, so we have a different dynamic here.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): That's not true.

Comm. Kohatsu: Depends, right? Birds might be a little bit different.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): Game animals belong to the public in Hawaii, just like they do everywhere else. Just because there are so many on private land, does not mean the landowner owns it.

Chair Sabati: And I believe the landowner can set the limits and seasons on animals, but not birds.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): Yeah, but he still doesn't own the animals.

Comm. Smith: The state does not assert ownership over public game mammals.

Unknown (public): I'd like to reaffirm, one of the problems that the press has is: the press cannot talk to anyone in any agency, except through the DLNR communication tapes. I once again would request to this commission, are there any—so, we're aerial shooting game animals because it's cost-effective. Is there any accountability to how much it costs, how many game mammals were killed across the state—not just on the mountain—and is there a number of what it would cost to make sure that game was not wasted? So essentially, asking for numbers from the Department to account for this program.

Comm. Buchanan: Can I respond to testimony from the public? Those numbers, I believe, are available from independent contractors and maybe not the state. So, people who are in the business of killing animals have done feasibility and economic studies on what it would cost per species of animals. I've seen it. So, I don't know if you're going to get that type of information from the state, but certainly in the management plans they should be accounting and have that reconciliation of costs per animal and, in the case of Mauna Kea, if you got half you left on the mountain and half not. My only testimony on all this stuff is: I am not a recreational hunter—I am a practitioner. There's a difference in that, at least I believe—as a native Hawaiian who is a subsistence practitioner—there's a difference in that. If I can tell you 40% of my total protein comes from wild, feral food sources, then I can ask you in your game management plan, "Are you leaving 40% for me to subsist on?" And if you cannot give me that answer, then we have a problem. So, that's from a different perspective. But that's what I always look for, and that's why management plans are important, because you actually do need to link those, you have to answer that question. If you're the management person of my public trust, you need to answer that question, because as we heard testimony before, those game animals are public trust, okay? So, getting back to what Ryan had said—and this is why waste with hunters is very important, to support your cultural practitioners, because they do have rights that are distinguishable. So, in this sense, I do want to support Ryan. It shocks me as a practitioner that we don't have any waste laws. I would like to see

enforcement—if I can catch somebody being stupid, and wasting food, because this food is not recreation for me—it’s my livelihood, yeah? I depend on that to feed my family. So, I support what Ryan is saying and I support the public testimony. I just want to find a solid way to move forward so we can make this happen. So, that’s where I am.

Comm. Kohatsu: I don’t have a motion, I’ll just build the next agenda item.

Comm. Buchanan: Well, after everybody has their input, then I’m happy to make a motion.

Chair Sabati: Motions? Comments? None?

Comm. Cremer: Like Lori said: before, I hunted recreationally for food. Like her, 40% of my food comes from the wild, whether I catch it or I trade it with somebody and get it. My friend just came from Alaska with a boat full of salmon and moose for me—he’s going home with pork, I brought out him and his son and we gathered. Sometimes what you catch is all that you can consume, but for me, I do a lot of trading: I get tako in my freezer, but I give the guy sausage, he gives them to me. That’s why I despise wasting stuff, because whether it affects me directly or indirectly, it affects somebody. Okay.

Chair Sabati: Thank you. Anybody from the audience? Okay, closing?

Comm. Buchanan: Let me put on the record one last thing. Just because I say I need to preserve 40% of my wild food sources—I am very cognizant as a conservationist and environmentalist, that that depends on an intact system, right? The biodiversity within my forest has to be intact. My watershed has to be protected, my native forest needs to be protected, all that is dependent on me sustaining my right to practice my culture. So, I think that’s the perfect balance, and if I didn’t believe we couldn’t find that balance, I wouldn’t be sitting here today. Balance, yeah? The word pono does not only mean righteous: it means balance. So, this is what I feel this commission is here for, at least that’s why I’m here today. I sit here today—read their prose and everything—to work collaboratively with the people who get paid to manage my resources, to ensure that I have that sustainable yield of my wild food sources, and also that my wild food sources don’t overtake my biodiversity that’s dependent for that all to be balanced. So, that’s it. I’ve just got to make that clear. Thank you.

Chair Sabati: Thank you.

Comm. Buchanan: On that note, let’s make a motion.

Comm. Ruidas: Are we closing?

Comm. Buchanan: Closed public testimony? See, this is why Commissioner Ruidas is going to be on our permitted Interaction Group!

Comm. Kohatsu: That’s the thing, I didn’t have a motion language. All I know is, I was just going to build the next agenda item for the next meeting with DOFAW staff.

Comm. Buchanan: And I hope that Commissioner Ruidas and I being here and serving on other important commissions in the past, that we kind of know how we need to move to get things done, yeah? In the interest of what the act says that this board needs to do. You closed public testimony? Okay. Should I make a motion? So, I move that we direct staff to do a review within the hunting rules to see if there’s anything about wanton waste and how that would work, and also to come back with suggestions on where we could place that, and then for that to be an action item on the next agenda and to clearly state that this commission will take action at that point. And I’m thinking the action item is just a specialist, not part of the motion, but that’s my motion first, and then we’ll have discussion.

Comm. Cremer: I second.

Chair Sabati: All in favor?

Comm. Buchanan: No, we have discussion. So, the part of the discussion—and this is to give direction to staff, to be clear—is for wanton waste, and the purpose is, this commission wants to move forward with some type of enforcement action and to be clear that people who are hunting in public lands are not wasting game, not moving it on the side, and if they do, they get their license revoked—whatever action needs to be done—and then we might take action on the next meeting to either submit a bill—oh! Part of that would also be the pathways to get that into the hunting rules—executive order, administrative rule-making, whatever it is—because it’s going to have to go to the Board right after that. And it can be as soon as the next meeting. That’s my discussion.

Comm. Smith: I don’t think we have the authority to direct staff, we can request the staff do things.

Comm. Buchanan: Well, I tell you, that’s why we need rules on your commission.

Comm. Smith: The DLNR can direct staff, but you could request—

Comm. Buchanan: Let’s ask staff. Can we ask staff? It’s a friendly amendment to my motion: I strike to direct my staff—I’d like to ask my staff if they can help us with that. Second to my amendment on the motion?

Commissioner Cremer seconds. All in favor. Commission takes a ten-minute recess.

ITEM 6. Updates on game bird harvest trends and latest proposal to develop a game bird monitoring methodology.

Chair Sabati: So, we have a presentation from Shaya.

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): All right. So, there’s going to be a lot of graphs with data points, and I’ll try to go through them slowly for everyone to understand what is going on. These are the updates on game bird harvest trends on the island of Hawaii, and I am going to talk about only three locations today. We have data for all locations, but I really didn’t want to show you all 40 or 50 graphs. So, I chose three important locations that I thought would be interesting to look at: Kapapala, Mauna Kea, and Kaohe. I put all three of them here together for you to see. So, on the Y-axis, where it says “birds per trip,” those are the number of birds harvested per hunter trip for the three locations. We have data from the 1990’s all the way up to this last season, for Kapapala. For Mauna Kea: from the 80’s up until last season—and then also from the 80’s to recently for Kaohe. I’m going to go through each area more in-depth after this slide, and then I’m going to also show you the harvest numbers per game bird species in these different areas as well. But just to point out: the numbers from the 90’s up until recently, if you take that peak out around 2003/2004, then it seems that they’re all kind of following the same trends as they are now. I did a regression line on this, but the regression stat test is not really appropriate for these types of data.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): I think it’s important to state where the information came from. This stuff all comes from whatever people put on a, quote, “sign-in sheet,” at a, quote, “check-in station.”

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): Yes, all of this data is coming from hunter check stations. And people can sometimes just post it or not post it or post the wrong numbers—it all varies. However, because we are looking at 30+ years, you can look at the trends and don’t have to analyze each year separately. So, the trends still exist. The interesting part is 2003/2004, that peak there—it seems like the harvest numbers are going up in the three locations, and I’m not really 100% sure why that is. The only reason that I can come up with is that it has something to do with environmental factors.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): I remember around that time we had some really appropriate rains and they were distributed—not heavy stuff all the time—right around the game bird production. I remember around 2005 it was very, very good hunting on the mountain.

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): Yes. So this is Kapapala, that I'm showing you now. It looks like 2005/2006, that's when the hunting was really good. There are black circles there and gray circles. The gray circles, I am missing a certain data point still. So, the gray circles might actually end up being higher than they are represented there. What that means is: for example, in 2005 people were harvesting two and a half birds let's say, or up to three birds per trip, going out to the field. And then now in 2016, last season, you have to make two trips to have one bird, basically. That's how you read this data.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): Shaya, excuse me, is that per hunter trip or per hunter hour?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): Per hunter trip. So, I did per hour first. It's a similar trend, but at the end it didn't make sense, because I don't know how many hours hunters are actually spending out there. Okay. For Kapapala, I'm only putting up four different species. The other species that we looked at were mainly zeros—people were not really harvesting those, or not able to harvest those—and then we had some random high points, but these are the species where the data points made sense. So, the first one is the California Quail that we looked at—again, number of birds harvested per trip—and again you can see within that species an increase in 2003/2004. The Kalij Pheasant is actually doing well. There are ups and downs in harvest every year—however, overall it seems like people are harvesting these animals more than in the 90's, for example, or even in early 2000. The Erckel's Francolin, as you can see, has ups and downs, but it's not really changing over time that much. And then the turkeys—again, not really changing. I mean, it's changing every year, the harvest, but it's not like a drastic increase or decrease. The one thing I want to point out here that is very important: the Y-axis on every species is different, if you look at the numbers. So, for the California Quail, Kalij Pheasant, and the Erckel's Francolin, there are similar axes, but the turkey is less. What that means is there is less turkey being harvested in Kapapala than these other three species. So, you have to make probably twenty trips to Kapapala to be able to, on average, catch a turkey. Again, these are harvest numbers—this is not accounting for hunter preference. So, maybe some hunter doesn't really like turkeys, and he or she wants to get another species—this doesn't account for that.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): When you compare Kapapala with the other jurisdictions, Kapapala does not have these spring turkey seasons.

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): Right. And this data does not include the spring turkey season.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): It does not include it? All of the data does not?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): All of the data that I am presenting today does not. I have the spring turkey season data completely separate. Okay. So, this is Mauna Kea—this is the same graph as the beginning I showed. So, there is the decrease, and then it goes up again in 2005, it comes down, and then it's kind of leveling off. If you compare the 1980's with recent years, not much has changed except for the normal ups and downs. And these are the different species for Mauna Kea—I'm showing you all eight species here. So, again California Quail: the harvest numbers at least are pretty stable. The Japanese Quail is all over the place, and then the Ring-necked Pheasant and the Kalij Pheasant—so the Kalij Pheasant, when I do a regression—it's not really appropriate for it, but it kind of has a downward trend—is probably decreasing over time a little bit, in harvest numbers. I can do complicated statistics on this to show decrease and increase, but I'm not 100% sure how useful that would be, because the

numbers are pretty clear. Okay. So, the Chukar, Gray Francolin, Erckel's Francolin, and turkey. So again, on Mauna Kea, the one species that is clearly showing me that there is a decrease in harvest is the Chukar—that is a very obvious decrease. And then you have the other species: the Erckel's Francolin, it seems that the harvest is actually going up the past couple of years; the Gray Francolin is all over the place—again, it really depends on so many different things; and then the turkey, interestingly enough, is not doing anything—the harvest seems to be stable. Again, I want to point out the Y-axes on all these species are different. Even though the Chukars are decreasing, it looks like in harvest numbers there are more Chukars than the other species on Mauna Kea, it seems. So, it looks like the Y-axis is one and a half and then the Y-axes on the other species are way, way lower, with the Gray Francolin being the lowest one. And then—this is the last one—Kaohe. Again, there is not much of an increase or a decrease except for that crazy peak for 2003/2004. And then these are the different species: it seems that in Kaohe, California Quail is the species that you encounter the most, or in this case, I guess it's harvested the most. And then the other species are not really going up or down, except for the natural fluctuations that happen during each year. So, the Chukars on Kaohe: there are not that many Chukars being harvested in Kaohe compared to Mauna Kea. The assumption would be maybe there are less, or maybe hunters there didn't want to shoot them. So again, the hunter preference is not accounted for.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): How do you segregate Kaohe and Mauna Kea?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): By check station. So, this is the data from the two check stations. So, if hunters are hunting on Mauna Kea and then they're reporting on Kaohe, then that's—

Richard Hoeflinger (public): So, the Kaohe data is from the Kilohana check station?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): Yes.

Kanalu Sproat (DOFAW): Whatever field forms came in at Kilohana station saying Kaohe, or whatever field forms came into Kilohana station saying Mauna Kea, or, say, Puu Huluhulu—

Richard Hoeflinger (public): So, Mauna Kea is Puu Huluhulu?

Kanalu Sproat (DOFAW): And Kilohana.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): That's what's defined as Mauna Kea?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): Okay. And lastly, the turkey harvest numbers for here: in the past seven years, it seems like it's coming down, but it has this natural fluctuation throughout the past 30 years., The take-home message is: the number of harvested animals in these areas is not drastically decreasing or drastically increasing—except if I had to pick a species that is really in trouble, I would pick Chukar. So, I think that's what this data tells us. And you are definitely correct: the hunters can record the data, or not, but this is what we have to work with. We have to work with the data that we have, and base our management decisions on the data that we get from the public. That said—I do realize that we do need to develop a game bird monitoring methodology, or a better one. For the island of Hawaii, we have hired a post-doc in the last couple of months. The post-doc will be working on coming up with this methodology to actually look at the numbers of game birds in these different areas. He'll be focusing mainly on Mauna Kea and Kapapala, only because we need to start somewhere, and I think these two areas are very clearly important. So, this past January/February, we had field site visits to Kapapala. Also, the post-doc and our interns went to the Palila count to kind of understand how they collect the data at the Palila counts and how we can use the data that they have for game birds, because they're counting the game birds in their counts as well. So, we did that in January/February, and then—

Richard Hoeflinger (public): Shaya, excuse me, you worked with Palila what?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): Palila counts.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): So, you looked at forest bird survey data, that's what you did?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): Yes. I looked at forest bird survey data. They also counted the game birds in their forest bird survey.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): Recently?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): No, for the past—actually, whatever years it's been.

Comm. Smith: Yeah, they count all the birds on those surveys, not just Palila.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): How far back?

Comm. Smith: At least back to '86 or something like that.

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): I have all that data as well, and I have pulled out all of the game bird species from that data. However, I don't believe that the methodology that we use for forest bird counts is appropriate for game bird counts, and I'm trying to figure out if I can somehow translate the data in a way that we can actually use all of that stuff.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): Why don't you believe in this count?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): So, there are different methodologies that you can use to count birds, and the forest bird data is point count method. You walk a certain distance, you stop, and then you listen and look for birds. With game birds, I think it may be more appropriate to use some methodology where you flush the birds out and you continuously walk on a transect and you look for them while you're walking.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): Because the game birds are ground-nesting birds and the forest birds are tree birds?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): Right. They're using a different environment.

Comm. Smith: It might have something to do with the detectability. The forest bird surveys are variable, circular count—they're designed specifically to try to detect those forest birds and a certain type of bird versus birds that are on the ground and the game-type birds. I think you would have to look at what methodology you use, and that may not be appropriate.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): Yeah, several years ago, we would pick essentially a transect, a walkable one, and pick our dogs up and flush birds to do a count. You might want to consider that, and you might get some volunteer help with doing this. We used to do that for many years.

Comm. Smith: You can do flush counts, you can do call counts. Yeah, we did that on Oahu for a while.

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): So, the one issue with that is when you use dogs—I do realize that a lot of people have used them—but it will still bias the information we're getting. It depends on the dog's condition, if it's a super active dog versus another dog, and then every time you do the survey—you want to do this type of survey once or twice a year—you don't get the same dog, so it really biases the data. We need to find something that we can say, "Okay, let's get 20 people here, these are the transects, go," and standardize the methodology. But in any case: in March right now, our post-doc is looking into literature and trying to see what everyone is doing, to come up with a best methodology. In April, we're planning to write the survey protocol, and we're planning to test it in Kuaokala GMA on Oahu—only because we're all on Oahu, and we don't want to take an extra trip and test things out and then go back. So, we'll test it there, make sure it actually works, and then after that we'll test it at Kapapala as well, not covering the whole Kapapala—maybe two or three transects, just to test things out—and then in May we'll analyze the data that we're getting from the testing, and make sure that

everything is okay—if we need to change something—and then start organizing for the surveys in October. So, the best-case scenario—if we have all the funds and everything—would be to do surveys in October, right before the game bird season, and then to do surveys later on after the game bird season ends, to get a good idea of what’s going on with the numbers, and whether there are any effects of hunting and what we’re doing. At the same time, the post-doc will also look at all the data that I just presented to you, to see if we can analyze this statistically. One of the tests that I was thinking is time series analysis—it takes a long time to do and it’s complicated. so we’re trying to figure out how we can get all this data together and make sense of it” Again, this is why it’s important that people actually record the harvest numbers that they get, and record it correctly, and do it all the time, because when we start analyzing the data and start putting it together and use it for our management plans in the future, it needs to be solid. In August, we’ll write the reports about the harvest data and the counts that we did, and then in September/October, we can do surveys—hopefully—on Mauna Kea and Kapapala, and then analyze by November and write a final report by December. This is a preliminary timetable—I hope this works.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): How is this funded, Shaya?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): It is funded by Pittman-Robinson grant and a very small percentage will be on the Wildlife Revolving Fund, but mainly on the Pittman-Robinson.

Comm. Kohatsu: Shaya, would you happen to know the amount of trips per area? Not the birds per trip, but the trips?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): Yes, I can pull that out of the data for sure—

Comm. Kohatsu: Just off the top of your head?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): No.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): Why did you pick Kapapala? I’m just curious.

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): Why Kapapala? I asked Joey, “What are the important game bird areas and he said, “Mauna Kea, Kaohe, Kapapala.” So, I said, “Okay, let’s analyze them!”

Richard Hoeflinger (public): So, I understand Mauna Kea and Kaohe [unintelligible] 23:30 Kapapala there’s never been known tabs anywhere near the number of birds off the mountain. I’m just curious.

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): Yeah, I mean—Sarah, correct me if I’m wrong—just looking at all the areas on the island of Hawaii, it seems that more people are going to Kapapala and Mauna Kea, are checking in and out of those areas. So, I figured, if more people are going there, then that would make sense.

Brian Ley (public): I have a question. So, let’s say when all this is done, and we have the data and so forth, what is the Department able to actually do? Or what would be some of the things they could do if populations are down and you figure out some of the things why?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): I cannot answer that right now. However, to be able to do any work with any species, you have to have an idea of their distribution, so I think this is a great step towards that. Also, pulling out all the harvest data from the past 30 years and going through them and actually getting them out there, I think it’s a good start. But what exactly we will do with this, I think that will be something for a later conversation.

Unknown (public): I should rephrase that: what would you be allowed to do?

Richard Hoeflinger (public): I would strongly encourage the Department, when they get this information—and along with the information you already have—to share that information with the

hunting community. And an appropriate place to do that would maybe on the website, which right now is just fluff pieces on the hunter education program. We'd like to see some data.

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): And I have been putting some—not these graphs—but some of the data on the newsletters as well.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): This is stuff that is of interest certainly to me, and I think to most hunters.

Comm. Cremer: I've got a question, Chair. You guys do bird releases here at Kapapala and Mauna Kea? Is there any bird releasing?

Kanalū Sproat (DOFAW): No.

Comm. Cremer: None?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): Any bird releases in Kapapala?

Comm. Cremer: No, I just was wondering, because on Kauai we've got people that raise them. I was just wondering how you guys would do it, because for us—and I discussed it with Lindsey—the birds get raised, they get released in August, and they're really not wild. So, the dogs do not have to work as hard to do the harvesting. I'm a dog enthusiast, I'm not a bird person. I like watching the dog work, it's what I like about the sport of bird hunting, and sometimes it's hard because you go there, but it's not going to be good for your dog. My friend owned a dog, and we don't go there because the birds are just—

Richard Hoeflinger (public): What your problem is, is you raise birds in captivity and then just turn them loose, which is not really bird hunting. You should do it like Parker Ranch, as an example. Parker Ranch brings in day-old chicks, they raise them as juveniles in a building that is heated and has whatever they need. As soon as they get some feathers on them, they go out in a flight pen. The flight pen is about an acre in size, so they can now develop their wing muscles. Now you take them out, and you actually got a bird that can fly. I've hand-raised birds and they're useful for dog training, but you put them in a release trap and shoot them about twelve feet in the air and they just fall back down again.

Chair Sabati: Thank you. We need to move on, anything else you wanted?

Kanalū Sproat (DOFAW): Jon? Ryan asked a question about hunter trips last year, and I have some information. So, last year we had on Mauna Kea 2,173 hunter trips and 9,455 hunter hours this past season. And I don't have the information now, but I was looking at it yesterday. So, it was a little higher than the averages from years before, but that's pretty close. And that was just for Mauna Kea. For everything west side—I don't have anything Kapapala—but we had 2,860 hunter trips or 12,276 hunter hours. Again, that was all a little higher, but still within normal.

Chair Sabati: Thank you.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): Can I make a suggestion? One other thing for these folks take a look at is the way the data are acquired. Because you know there's a bias built into the way you acquire the data. I agree with you there should be value with the trend data, the absolute value is suspect.

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): I agree with you. And that's why I think it's important not to look at the actual absolute values, but to only look at trends. Trend is a really powerful tool that we have.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): But you could do some things that are fairly simple that would improve on the value, like not setting up stuff out for public desecration and vandalism, which does occur.

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): And that's a good point, and that's why a Mobil App would be appropriate. You have it on your phone, you record your data in the APP, and that's it.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): Well, I'd like to applaud the Department for taking this step. This is a step in the right direction. Thank you very much.

Chair Sabati: Thank you. Commissioners?

Brian Ley (public): Is there a reason why you can't go and do a sample survey and talk to some of the people? You've got the names of the hunters. Why can't you talk to the hunters? I can tell you where I hunt, I can give you exactly where the birds are better this year than last year—what's changed and everything else—to give you guys a more informed idea on what's going on. Ryan and I and the other bird hunters spend an immemorable amount of time starting in September with my dogs out there.

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): So, there are two reasons. Number one is: we want to come up with a method that we can standardize, so that we can do the same transects every year, with people and during certain hours, so when you analyze the data, you're not biased by hunters, by tracks. Number two is: the information that the hunters have—yes, I agree with you, it's very valuable—it will only be valuable if we have GPS points of the routes that you're taking, and after which points you see the animals. So, if you have GPS points from point A to B, you're walking up the mountain or down the mountain, and then every time you see an animal, you record those things? Then yes, I can definitely use that, to come up with an estimate. But we cannot use it if it's just one or two or three, or even ten hunters, there need to be a lot of people involved, taking the GPS points every 100 or 150 meters, so we can see the route. There is an actual name for this type of data collection. It's a reconnaissance type of data collection.

Brian Ley (public): Why don't you put it out to the hunters on September? "You come out with your bird dog, and here's an app with a GPS"—because everyone has that—and we can participate and help you guys and give you that data at the end of the day. That September 3rd, we all show up. "You work this hill, you work that hill." I mean, it's not perfect, but at least it'll give you guys a little more standard idea.

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): Right, yes. And this is great that you brought it up, because once we do have this app, one of the things I'm hoping is built into it will be: you can take these GPS points with your phone, and have a track, and then you can choose to upload that towards this, if you wanted to, so it will be all in the same one. So, if you harvest an animal here, if you saw an animal there, you record all of this information, and then it just gets uploaded.

Chair Sabati: Okay. Commissioners?

Comm. Kohatsu: Is this game bird related, or would there be any reservations for the Department doing a similar thing for game mammals in our areas?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): That's a great question. We have looked at animal distribution—like pig distribution on Oahu—so we have all the maps and all the data for that, so the distribution is basically like a relative abundance of where the pigs are. We're doing similar work on Maui right now. We have a graduate student out there basically setting up cameras out in the field and trying to figure out the distribution of pigs on Maui. We are also looking at disturbance level of the pigs as well. It would be great if we could do something similar for deer.

Comm. Kohatsu: Wasn't that an idea of a potential action item or whatever? People were missing the metrics for hunters to look at—

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): Oh! You mean the harvest data?

Comm. Kohatsu: Yeah, this harvest data, and you have a trip and whatever.

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): I am collecting the game mammal data the same time I'm collecting game birds. I just haven't put it together—between Sarah and I, it takes so much time to put this together. But we're doing that.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): I think Ryan and I are making the same point. That information is of interest to the hunting community. If I have to fault DLNR—I guess I have—the last reports of any game animals, to my knowledge, go back to the 70's when Griffin did his stuff on game mammals up on the mountain.

Comm. Smith: There are studies, not reports—

Richard Hoeflinger (public): I don't remember ever seeing a report from DLNR that's available to the public on this stuff. And we would like to see it, it's good stuff.

Comm. Smith: There's a really nice study going right now with the University of Hawaii—so that's going to be stuff that I think you'll be really interested in. Pigs are notoriously—

Richard Hoeflinger (public): Things aren't available to people who really could make good use of it.

Comm. Smith: If you look at the literature, pigs are notoriously difficult to monitor, to mark and capture a pig is one of the few methods—it's really very difficult to come up with a statistically valid way of monitoring pig, especially densities and that kind of thing.

Chair Sabati: Okay, you've got to stay on subject.

Comm. Smith: Actually, the work that's being done with the University of Hawaii right now is really good, so I think that would be a really interesting study.

Comm. Cremer: There's some data collection as far as birds—and I know we go off track with pigs—but I think a lot of the information is biased right now, because plenty of people are not marking the harvest.

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): It's not affecting the trend, though, so it's not that biased.

Comm. Cremer: But what about the harvest collection?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): That's the thing. So, people are recording the harvest numbers—whether there are ten people hunting and five of them are recording or whatever—because it's over 30 plus years, it doesn't make that big of a difference.

Comm. Cremer: Okay, I understand

Richard Hoeflinger (public): You assume that everybody lies consistently.

Comm. Cremer: Like we discussed in prior meetings, an app would be perfect, because now people wouldn't be afraid to say—

Chair Sabati: Okay. Yeah, let's move on, we're not talking about the issue. All right, Commissioners?

Unknown (public): Have you checked to see if there was a drought during those times?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): I have not had a chance to look at any environmental factors yet. It was requested last week that we talk about birds, and then Sarah and I worked through the weekend and late nights and got it all together.

Comm. Smith: Good job! Thank you.

Comm. Buchanan: Kanalu, I have a question for you. Do you know the numbers you just gave us? That was only for bird hunting?

Kanalu Sproat (DOFAW): Yeah, and that was only for the west side of Big Island.

Comm. Buchanan: Okay, that's all I need to know. Thank you.

Chair Sabati: Commissioners? Okay. Closing public testimony, we need to move on.

ITEM 7. Updates on Hawaii Island Game Management Plan.

Chair Sabati: Updates? Status? Where are we at?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): Just for the record, the draft of the game management plan was submitted to the working group on June 27, 2017, about eight and a half months ago. The email—correct me if I’m wrong, Jim—basically was to the working group asking them to please look at the draft and give us any comments, and that after having the comments we can all move forward and have a meeting and then talk about how we’re going to continue with this plan. I personally did not receive a single email from the working group until two nights ago—at 9 PM—and it was a letter. And again, for the record, I want to mention the fact that the draft of the game management plan was submitted to the working group and not the county GMAC. So, when I saw the letter that came from the county GMAC to me, I was a little surprised to see that there were comments on the draft from the county GMAC. I also want to say, for the record, the game management plan is not complete. It’s a draft. We still have a lot of work ahead of us.

Chair Sabati: Commissioners?

Comm. Kohatsu: Yeah, I do have my own discussion to add to that. This is just for edification of the commission and maybe the public. I took a look at the 2018 report to the legislature, for the Wildlife Revolving Fund, and there’s a particular section where we have: “acquire new lands for public use, if DOFAW does not satisfy the growing demand for access to public hunting areas, and if hunting pressure is not applied across the larger landscape, then game animals will become scarce in some existing hunting areas and will cause increasing amounts of damage in inaccessible public and private lands.” But I was curious if someone could elaborate on that phrase, that “game animals will become scarce in existing hunting areas,” and what that kind of meant in the grand scheme of things. I would assume that was something that Shaya wrote?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): I do not recall...

Comm. Kohatsu: Oh, it’s in the report.

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): I have to read it myself, actually. But does it have to do with the game management plan?

Comm. Kohatsu: Yeah, all I wanted was—the report shows that we have an increasing number of hunting license sales and an increasing number of out-of-state hunting license sales, and this phrase maybe implies the idea that our hunting areas may be more stressed if we do not look at bigger areas, or we do not consider what we’re doing now, management plans within the areas that we already have. So, is that the position of the Department when they say that? The game animals may become scarce in some existing public hunting areas? Just curious.

Comm. Smith: I’m not sure that this has to do with the item. But at some point, yeah, there’s going to be a carrying capacity on any piece of land. If you have more people on the same amount of land, at some point you’re going to reach carrying capacity, so it’s important to look at maybe what carrying capacity is and how we serve the existing hunters. One of my top priorities is trying to add additional lands, and we’ve been doing an inventory. We’re starting with Hawaii Island and moving on down the chain and trying to look at all the state lands that are either unencumbered or under revocable permits or also under leases—especially grazing leases—and trying to look at various things that might be appropriate for DOFAW to have the lands EO’d to DOFAW for additional areas for hunting. But I really think that’s an important thing to focus on. It’d be nice to see the commission or the hunting community try to help us out with that.

Comm. Kohatsu: Yeah. I just remember in the past history of this report, there used to be maps on the back that would delineate A1, A2, A3, A4 sections, and I believe maybe the past administrator was working on C1, or whatever. Is there a particular reason why that's excluded from the plan nowadays?

Comm. Smith: Well, you're talking about the legislative report, right?

Comm. Kohatsu: Yeah, the report for the revolving fund. What I'm saying is, those designations don't provide a policy or a decision-making process for what kind of plans can be made in any area whatsoever.

Comm. Smith: I'm not really sure we can talk offline on that. I'm not really sure what the question is, to tell you the truth. So, you're saying the reports are different than in the past—

Comm. Kohatsu: The question is that—it was just even a couple of years ago these maps used to exist, and now they don't. It's pretty widely known that the resistance to the Hawaii Game Management Plan, or any game management plan—especially with respect to game mammals—is that there's no policy or direction from the DLNR that says, "This area I can do this, this area I can do this, this area I can do that." It was also echoed by one of our public members, "Well, we can study everything, but what are we going to do with it?" So, we know the hurdles are: endangered species, watershed, all these other public interests. But the majority of community members show up to our meetings wanting to know, "What can we do with the game mammals that they have in the areas they already hunt?" And it is my understanding that it is the state's prerogative to be able to create plans and decide what they can do with them. Now, somebody else can sue you for them, whatever. But it's still under the state prerogative that they can decide those things and policies and what they would implement in certain areas—like, "This is for production, this space you've got to eradicate this." Am I incorrect in that?

Comm. Smith: I mean, obviously all the public hunting areas are mapped, so we know where we can hunt. We're coming out with a set of what we call management guidelines, which I think does kind of what you're talking about: different types of hunting management on different lands, different types of conservation zone lands, and trying to prioritize those lands, so what's highest priority, second priority, third priority, that kind of thing. Is that what you're talking about? We are working on that, it's actually on my desk. I'm working on it, trying to finalize those, and once those get finalized, we'll come up with—

Comm. Kohatsu: Okay, I was just elaborating on, I remember a past meeting you were at the Hawaii County GMAC and you made a specific distinction—because I tend to pay attention—the hunting program versus the game management program, that you run a hunting program, but I didn't necessarily get your policy on what is your game management program. Is that fair to say that—

Comm. Smith: I'm not sure that's a distinction. I mean, hunting is game management.

Comm. Kohatsu: Okay. Yeah, I guess we can talk about rules and all this other stuff—how we hunt wanton waste, or whatever—but the key difference today, with the communities I have to serve now, is that, yeah, they care about whether they can hunt, or which area's open, or this and that. But they also care about, "Is this mammal"—be it goat, sheep, deer, pig, whatever—"that I hunt here going to be here five years from now, ten years from now?" And right now, there is no direction, there is no policy on those things. Right now, what happens is: some other interest can come in and supersede all of that, and it all disappears in the absence of any other direction or any other plan. So, this is the root of why we're called a game management advisory commission. We can talk about the hunting program all day, but the interest is in game management. It was such a huge step to see Shaya's bird thing, but it'd be another huge step if that same interest kind of moves over to game mammals as well.

Comm. Smith: Yep. We would like to bring more science to it. It's hard. I was the wildlife manager on Oahu for 18 years. Coming up with accurate survey maps of game mammals is hard, the methodology is difficult, to come up with something that's statistically valid. I'm talking to Shaya about it. We have a really nice study going with UH, which is the best thing I've seen for a long time. It's a really nice-looking study, so hopefully that'll come out. When you see that, hopefully you're going to have the same— hearing about the stuff Shaya's trying to do with game birds, and seeing some of the data that she's been able to pull together—we would like to be able to pull good data like that for mammals as well.

Comm. Kohatsu: Okay. Just for the community's sake, they think—I'll be honest—they think everywhere that they hunt is going to be eradicated someday. So, what are your thoughts on that?

Comm. Smith: That is not true.

Comm. Kohatsu: That's not true?

Comm. Cremer: I think hunting is a part of game management, but I don't think hunting is a game management plan that is at its total. Game management is being able to know how many animals get harvested from one place, knowing how many animals are sustainable in one place, and not all about hunting. I think we need to have a game management plan that is set in stone for different sections on different islands, and I don't think that hunting is a game management plan—it's a part of game management, but it's not a game management plan.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): You're right on. Hunting is a part of a game management plan, but—

Chair Sabati: Okay. Let's get one more—Ryan?

Comm. Kohatsu: Currently, all of our plans are wrapped up in EA's, environmental assessments or whatever. What is the Department's view on those EA's that just continue to drag on and go nowhere because multiple stakeholders are moving things on? Does the Department have any interest in taking prerogative to getting plans done, or will we continue this long process with respect to game mammals?

Comm. Smith: Can you give me an example?

Comm. Kohatsu: I believe Kanaio's going into an EA for hunting, and we have one here for Puu Waawaa, and stuff like that, and everyone knows: it's all endangered species, it's all this kind of stuff. What happens when these things continually drag on and we don't really go anywhere? Is there a thing where maybe you might consider a different plan, or maybe just taking prerogative and—

Comm. Smith: Well, Kanaio—it's not dragging on.

Comm. Kohatsu: It takes a while, yeah.

Comm. Smith: We're requesting funding to do a plan and we haven't been able to get the funding. So, there's not an EA that's dragging on, there's just—

Comm. Kohatsu: So, an absence of an EA, then? Like, for places that we already hunt, that don't have an EA for game mammals or whatever. Can the state take action in directing what we do with those game mammals now? Instead of kind of just sitting there and saying, "Oh, well, we're waiting for whatever endangered species to tell me what I can and cannot do."

Comm. Smith: So, give me an example of what you're talking about.

Comm. Kohatsu: Let's say you wanted to change bag limits, you wanted to even move animals. They're already yours now, they exist today, right now. But in the past, there's always been this obstacle where you say, "Oh no, we can't touch that because of this, because of that," whatever it is. But it is state property, it is state land. So, I was just wondering, because we've been wrapped up with all of that, and even the past administrator with the management plan was saying, "We can't move forward because of

this or that.” All I know is those obstacles have not disappeared—they still exist. It’s just that—we’re not going anywhere unless some kind of effort or decision is made, and I’m like, “Hey, this stuff is a little bit too much,” or “This is adequate,” and we just go.

Comm. Smith: What do you mean by going somewhere, where are you going?

Comm. Kohatsu: We can’t hold public hunts in these places until these plans happen, is what I’m saying. You can’t change them, you can’t modify them. The only way you can modify them is if you say, “Okay, no bag limit. You guys, kill them all.” “We can do that tomorrow if you want.” “But no, wait. We want to keep some animals here, because they’re already there.” Those things cannot be said, you know?

Comm. Smith: Well, I don’t agree that just having no bag limits or having a year-round daily program means you’re going to kill all the animals. We have lots of areas where we have year-round daily and we’re not killing all the animals. It’s a sustainable way to manage the area. And so, in a lot of these areas, I think we could do that, and if we could get support from the hunting community—if the hunting community says, “That’s what we want, we just want to be able to go in there year-round daily and hunt animals,” then a lot of these areas we can open up for that. If you want to make it more restrictive and try to drive up the numbers of animals through restricting pressure on them, then you’re making an affirmative decision to do that, and there could be constraints based on the other resources that can be affected. But in terms of endangered species law and whatnot, we can pretty much go in and open areas up for year-round daily, and honestly, I think that’s a really good way to hunt a lot of areas, in that you can have sustainable animal populations with a year-round daily hunt. That’s what I would advocate, rather than closing it altogether and waiting, waiting, waiting, so you can do this enhancement thing. Maybe try year-round daily and see if it works. If it’s working, great.

Comm. Kohatsu: Yeah, but my question is not aimed at that. My intention with it is the restrictive part of it, the management part of it. That’s the hard part.

Comm. Smith: If you want to do enhancement, you’ll have to do the environmental compliance.

Comm. Kohatsu: All I’m saying is, we’ve never completed one—ever—and there’s a history of trying. Are we ever going get anywhere? What’s your feeling? Are we moving?

Comm. Kohatsu: I mean, it’s not just game, too. These are very difficult plans, extremely technical. You have to get a concurrence from a lot of different agencies. For instance, we’re doing endangered seabirds for Kauai—HCP’s—and that’s been going on forever. It’s been going on for at least ten years. It’s just a very difficult process, so the issues with compliance and environmental assessments and environmental impact statements are not limited to game.

Comm. Kohatsu: Yeah, but an HCP or something like that is totally in the state’s prerogative. Like the issue of an incidental take license or anything like that—is that purely a state prerogative, or is that something the Feds have to sign off on as well?

Comm. Smith: The Feds have input on it through their biological opinion, and then it has to be approved by the Endangered Species Recovery Committee, and then that goes to the Board of Land and Natural Resources.

Comm. Kohatsu: ESRC has to have a prior approval, or can the Board approve an incident take list—

Comm. Smith: I forget, I can’t remember the process exactly—I don’t know if Jim knows—but basically if the ESRC does not approve it, I think the Board can, and it has to go to the Legislature and get 2/3 approval vote or something like that.

Comm. Kohatsu: So, in the instance where the federal opinion does not align with what the state maybe was inclined to do, then what?

Comm. Smith: Then you're going to have a very difficult time getting approval to do that for federal funds.

Comm. Kohatsu: For federal funds. But can the state approve it purely on their own?

Comm. Smith: We can't take species any more than anybody else can. The state can't take endangered species any more than a private citizen can. So, the HCP would give us license to take endangered species.

Comm. Kohatsu: But the HCP is purely state-issued, right?

Comm. Smith: It's a state process that allows you to take an incidental take permit for endangered species take.

Comm. Kohatsu: But in absence of one—no take license—then all the animals that are there right now, eating whatever species there are: is that a problem?

Comm. Smith: If it's not an affirmative action—in other words, it's just open year-round daily—then we can do that, because we're doing as much as we can without an affirmative action. If we take an affirmative action to enhance game numbers and that is endangering any species, then you're going to be in jeopardy.

Comm. Kohatsu: Jeopardy of just the ESRC not approving? Or of some special interest group taking you to lawsuit?

Comm. Smith: No, it would be of violating the law.

Comm. Kohatsu: Violating the law. But we're currently doing that right now anyway, right?

Comm. Smith: No, I don't think so.

Comm. Kohatsu: So, when a sheep on DHHL property eats an endangered plant, is that allowed? Anywhere, just pick anywhere. All I'm saying is, these things exist now, we have them. It is the state's prerogative to take care of it absent of federal restrictions, right?

Comm. Smith: Take care of what?

Comm. Kohatsu: To take care of however the state feels like managing what they have right now. Do you have to wait for federal approval to do what the state should be able to do?

Comm. Smith: The state should be able to do meaning what?

Comm. Kohatsu: So, say you had a hunting area and you wanted to reduce the take, right? You wanted to limit, put some restrictions on animals.

Comm. Smith: You want to enhance game, have more game mammals?

Comm. Kohatsu: Not enhancing, just restricting the take. It might actually not be enhancing, the population might still be decreasing even with restricting the take, right? That's just subjective.

Comm. Smith: If you could demonstrate that, then you'd be okay. I think.

Comm. Kohatsu: So, you're saying anything that reduces game is acceptable to the state, but anything that increases it is not acceptable.

Comm. Smith: No. We're not saying that.

Comm. Kohatsu: Oh. Okay. It's just an exercise, I mean—

Comm. Smith: I'm saying, taking affirmative action to manage animals in a way that would result in the take of endangered species would be illegal, and we cannot do that without a permit.

Comm. Kohatsu: Yeah, but where this comes back to is: in the Hawaii Island Game Management Plan, enhancement or the continued existence of game species which are potentially detrimental would be in this plan. Therefore, this plan would be subject to such people, right? And we wouldn't be able to move forward in such a case. Or could the state just adopt one?

Comm. Smith: I think I've answered that. If we enhance game mammals and they take endangered species, then we're in violation of the law.

Comm. Kohatsu: Okay. I just—

Comm. Buchanan: Commissioner Kohatsu, are you on the working group?

Comm. Kohatsu: I am not on the working group.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): I was on the working group. Can I respond?

Comm. Buchanan: Hang on. I think Commissioner Kohatsu should be on the working group. Okay.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): As one of the two members of the original working group that are in this room, I will respond to one of Shaya's comments that she hasn't received anything from the working group in seven months. The working group didn't receive anything from DLNR for seven years. We submitted a 165-page draft report in July of 2010 and never received a peep from DLNR until last year. What we got was a butchered-up piece of stuff that we can't make any sense of. There was no correlation of where comments were inserted with respect to the original document. We tried to go through a page-by-page comparison that you got to us, and we all finally threw up our hands—there's no way to do it. And we don't know what you were expecting us to do—we can't work magic. But that piece of junk that you submitted to us just has stuff stuffed into it, pieces written out, with no explanation or nothing. How do you expect to get anything? It's rubbish. So, that's my comment as a member of the working group on what we got, and I don't know where to go from here. There was never any instruction when we got the document as to what was going to follow, were we going to get together, sit down, talk about it, blah, blah—nothing. They just sent us a piece of rubbish. Thank you.

Comm. Kohatsu: You know the C1, C2, C3 stuff? Is there a timeline for when that's going to be done?

Comm. Smith: Yes, everybody's asking for it. I'm going to get it done.

Comm. Buchanan: Mr. Chair, I don't know what they're talking about. What is C1, C2?

Comm. Smith: It's a part of the management plots that relates to document.

Comm. Buchanan: Okay, so we're taking about the game management plan again?

Comm. Smith: No, we're not.

Comm. Buchanan: So, on the agenda is the game management plan, which I'm not familiar with, although I have a little bit of background. So, I want to fix what the concerns are. I just want to get to the point where this can get addressed, and it's a pretty broad thing on the agenda item today, Mr. Chair. So, if commissioners have already got where we are, then let's fix it.

Comm. Kohatsu: Yeah, I can elaborate. So, the C1, C2 stuff, it would take a picture, a map of Big Island, and it would designate areas: "This is conservation, this is preservation, this is an area we can enhance game, this is an area we cannot, this is an area with control," there were these designations. It creates a general overall policy on the Department of what they can do with certain areas. Without that policy, it doesn't matter whether the staff or anyone has ideas of what to do, we have no direction in what is acceptable in state land. That is the significance of that to hunting.

Chair Sabati: But going back to the game management plan, what Mr. Hoeflinger was saying: if you take the original plan that was submitted and the one that was given back to the working committee to

review, and you go page by page with significant changes with no explanation of why the changes were made and there was mass confusion, how do we remedy this?

Comm. Buchanan: I have some suggestions when you're ready for it!

Comm. Cremer: I'd like to add something about what Ryan was saying about the designated areas. It seems like we're not going to get those designated areas, there's not going to be any enhancements from what I understand he's saying, because the problem is with endangered species and breaking the law. So, how can we get a game management plan if everything is not enhancing game because we're worrying about a plant? That is what I heard, correct me if I'm wrong.

Unknown: I think the key is that multi-use areas, right, that's kind of what we'd have to—

Comm. Smith: We have multi-use, we have multiple resources that we have to balance. And I would rather focus on what are we doing about producing a good public hunting program. Do we have a good program or not? How can we improve that?

Comm. Kohatsu: Yeah, I think we have a great program, I don't think anyone is against that. They can hunt, there are pretty liberal rules or whatever it is.

Comm. Smith: Thank you.

Comm. Kohatsu: But they're worried that when they go out there five or ten years now, there's nothing for them to hunt, that's what they're worried about.

Comm. Kohatsu: One of my favorite sayings is: "Worrying is the misuse of the imagination." So, what we're talking about is what people are worried about, which isn't necessarily reality.

Comm. Kohatsu: Yeah, but my occupation on the commission is to grasp the concerns of the hunting community. I might believe what you say, but I'm just a mouthpiece for whoever is giving me concerns.

Comm. Smith: I acknowledge that you are reflecting worry in the hunting community. I would like to focus on providing a good hunting program. And, like you say, I think we have one.

Comm. Buchanan: So, correct me if I'm wrong, but I heard from Ryan that hunters—especially here on the Big Island or statewide—are worried about future hunting, so that's a separate question, and you keep on chiming in on designation and trying to work on our management plan. Well, land use in the State of Hawaii is clearly defined: designations, land use, zoning, and all that stuff, is set in statute. So, whether the Department designates or declares or whatever something, there's a process for that. Everything is about process. I love process, I'm a process person. So, that can all be addressed in the bigger management plan, which will take some time. But it makes me sad to hear that the community made an effort, gave it to the Department—the agency at the Department whose fiduciary duty it is to take care of my public trust, who changes administrations every time we have a new governor. So, there needs to be consistency and process that is followed from administration to administration. I would suggest, just how Representative Tupola came at Waianae meeting and said out of frustration, "You know what? Let's start over!" So, in this case you already have a lot of data, and verbiage, and documents and stuff, and it seems like the working group needs to be reconvened, maybe adding new blood and new people, and members of the agencies that can contribute and that working group can reconvene and pick up where you folks left off. Staff would come and explain the gutted-out management plan that was a rebuttal to the community plan, and then at some point in time—and timelines are very important: I won't do anything unless you put a timeline on it, because somebody has to answer, and it's not going to take them ten years to answer. "In six months, we want this." You heard me say earlier: I would like staff to report at the next meeting, by which we can take action. So, the Big

Island Game Management Plan is a very complex document, because, as the administrator pointed out, there's so many interests that the Department is in charge of—my interests as a native Hawaiian, federal interest for furthering threatened and endangered species, Section 7, Section 6—all of these things are complex issues, and they're going to take time to work through. However, that doesn't mean that you just drop your head and say, "Ugh!" No, you've got to work through it. So, my suggestion is to reconvene the working group, get new blood in there, put up a timeline, ask the administrator, or whoever needs to be involved in this, if you guys can have meetings once a month, and then set benchmarks and when you're going to have some deliverables, like a rough draft, or at least, that you guys met, and met once a month, and met with Joey and Kanalu and whoever you've got to meet with. And then that's its own thing on the agenda item, to work on that game management plan. In the meantime, our administrator—thank you very much—has told this commission that he encourages us to work with on-island staff. That's awesome. So, while this is all going on, I hope that every commissioner takes their part, calls up their working staff on each island and says, "Hey, we have this concern," and tries to work with them on that level. Is that correct?

Comm. Smith: Yeah. I think a lot of the work should be done on the branches and on the specific islands. It gets most productive to actually make sure you—

Comm. Buchanan: It's the short-term, and the long-term is the game management plan. So, hopefully you can get all of this stuff resolved. The game management plan will ensure that you would have a future for hunting. They have to do it, because the law says, as a subsistence practitioner, they cannot regulate my culture out of existence. So, they have to ensure by law that I will be able to gather—and not only gather, but gather in places where I have traditionally gathered for years and years, and generations. So, that stuff doesn't worry me, because all that's going to be worked out in the management plan. And then in the meantime, we work on the ground, and if there's really big concerns, come back to the commissioner. Then we go to our representatives, we shake the tree and we get what we need. But that was just a suggestion and commissioners can expound.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): You know, I think you made a really good point. The one thing that's frustrating is, this plan was put together by the community and DLNR. DLNR was an integral part of the working group. Well, now we have some different people in DLNR and they have some different ideas, and that's just where we are. So, your point on consistency and some kind of a long-term planning process is right on the money. It's why we have a four-year locked plan, that's as far as anybody goes. You get a new administration, you get new people, you start all over again.

Comm. Buchanan: Thank you. Mr. Chair, can I respond? I can see that maybe administrator wants to respond. The Department has multiple plans: statewide plans, forestry plans, they have multiple plans. I've read most of them, so I understand your frustration. But again, let's do it again, let's start all over, let's put a timeline on it, let's get a report on it—the game commission needs to hear that report—and let's go from there. So, half of the island's staff here is today—

Comm. Smith: More than half.

Comm. Buchanan: More than half? I mean, these people are working for us. They're protecting what we need to protect and they're helping us do what we need to do. I would have to ask them to keep on helping us, even though we're frustrated. Believe me, I'm super frustrated, so I took steps to educate myself, and that's why I know about zoning, declarations, conservation districts one, two, and three, habitat conservation plans, whatever. But I learned to work through that. So, I will offer whatever

knowledge I have. I'm encouraging our commissioners here to join our working group, and then also life-long hunters—whether they be bird, sheep, goat, pig, whatever—they all need to be on that part of the working group, too—and practitioners.

Comm. Smith: Can I comment? Honestly, just as a professional land manager/biologist, this might be misplaced effort. I'm not sure the plan is really going to help us out. I mean, if we take that level of effort that we're going to put into this plan, maybe we can get better outcomes for the hunting community and public hunting in general in Hawaii by doing other things, besides having this plan. I'm not really sure what this game management's plan going to accomplish. I'll be glad to sit down and take another look at it. I mean, Dick's characterization of what he got back from us might be our characterization of what we got in the first place. We're just kind of going back and forth on this thing, spending a whole bunch of time and effort and energy, and I'm not really sure that's where we should be putting our effort and energy. I think we might be able to get better outcomes with a different approach, and maybe we should sit down with some of the folks, like Dick, who were involved in the original effort. For the most part, most of the people in this room are our staff and the people working on this particular plan, a lot of them are new, so it'd be good to sit down and just revisit it, take a fresh look at it.

Comm. Buchanan: Mr. Chair? Administrator: you said different approach. Can you expound on what you mean by different approach?

Comm. Smith: I'm not really sure—I just think we should take a look at the thing. We have changed our approach on a number of things. We had HCP's that were pushed through for years and we go to a certain point and we go, "Gee, do we really need an HCP here?" We had another thing where we were going for a PEIS—problematic EIS—for rodenticide that we pushed through for years and we got to a certain point and we said, "God, we don't really even need this," and we just stopped. So, a lot of these very bureaucratic and programmatic kind of approaches we kind of think we know what we need and we get to a certain point and just decide, "This isn't really going to get us anything, this isn't going to produce any kind of tangible improvement over the situation," and so we stop—or it's unnecessary, we don't really need this anymore. So, maybe it'd be worth talking about.

Comm. Buchanan: Okay, Mr. Administrator. Mr. Chair, if I can respond. That sounds like an internal agency issue, because you guys are changing your priorities within the Department.

Comm. Smith: No, it has nothing to do with changing priorities. It's just these things are complicated—there's a lot of legal issues. The things that I'm talking about did not have to do with changing priorities.

Comm. Buchanan: You just said, "I want to do rodenticide, so why am I going through the trouble, ten years into rodenticide in a bureaucratic process?" Management tools—you're either going to use rodenticide or you're not, that's all part of internal agency kind of stuff.

Comm. Smith: That didn't have anything to do with changing priorities.

Comm. Buchanan: So, let me make a suggestion, if you're amenable to that: how about you take four meetings, you commit to four meetings with this community, to figure out how far away you guys are from what the community's suggestions was ten years ago, or whatever—900 million years ago—and what you guys submitted back to them, and at least identify within four meetings what the big issues are, from then until now, and bring that back to the GMAC, and then we can reevaluate. Can you commit to four meetings with a working group?

Comm. Smith: Sure. Maybe we could talk about whether it's even a viable effort.

Comm. Buchanan: You can talk about whatever you like, but at least I'd like to know that people on Maku O Keawe are going to have four meetings that the administrator said—his staff is going to be there—we're going to have structured discussion at least on actually where we are. And then come back and do a report to this party. And then I would say, if that's amenable to my commissioners over here—or do you guys have a different suggestion?

Comm. Kohatsu: I do have an addition: what would be the administrator's viewpoint on the other divisions that have stakeholder interest in the same areas? Because we know what the butt-heads part is, where we have different opinions about what we should do with an area, right? And we see our wildlife division all the time, but we don't necessarily have meetings together with the cross groups, like where we would maybe be opposing each other. But then, if we sat across the table from each other, maybe we could come up with something better.

Comm. Smith: What groups are you talking about?

Comm. Kohatsu: Like the NARS, like watershed, or any other interest group that would be in opposition to any progress, because we all lose in the end when we just butt heads like this, right? But we're just talking among ourselves here. I don't know if the other divisions would need some kind of directive or maybe policy from you that "oh it's okay for us to meet together and do this."

Comm. Smith: I represent all of Division of Forestry and Wildlife. Rather than this four-meeting thing or whatever, rather than focusing on driving at this plan, we should just sit down with guys like Dick and some of the people who were instrumental in that whole effort to begin with and talk about where we're going and what we're trying to accomplish—I mean, really starting to take a fresh look at it. It's been a lot of years, it seems like we haven't gotten anywhere. Maybe we just need to look at this. Are we going in the right direction or are we just tilting at the same windmill?

Comm. Kohatsu: Yeah. Well, I'm just saying, bringing in the interests that—we know that there's barriers to it, we've been at this for a while. It's just, can we bring those things that—

Comm. Smith: Honestly, I'm not that familiar with it. So, it would be nice to sit down with Dick, and I can certainly commit to that and talking about it and looking at the original and the revised.

Comm. Cremer: It seems as though you have a stronghold on not having a game management plan in that direction. What is your direction that you think would help us as a gathering community and help our areas of hunting, and people not to worry about how the game is depleting now and how there is overhunting on state land? What direction do you think we could do, besides the game management plan, that would help us as a hunting and gathering community?

Comm. Smith: I'm not saying I'm against having a game management plan. I'm just saying I'd like to take a fresh look at it. I haven't really been involved directly in the game management plan. I would like to sit down and talk about it and say, "Is this really what we want to do?" And we'd like some direction from the hunting community in terms of, what would you consider to be improvements? It sounds like a lot of it's based on worries. So, how can we help alleviate people's worries about things that might happen?

Comm. Cremer: I honestly think there's worries because they see the depletion already. They're worried they're going to get nothing instead of minimum. Right now, our game mammals are minimum, and the hunting is overhunted, whether you guys agree or not—and I know you guys get pressure from all the other groups—and I think Commissioner Buchanan's idea of having four meetings, where you guys sit down with the working group, is an excellent idea.

(public): I'd just like to ask: Mr. Smith, are you aware of any other state in forestry, in fish and wildlife, that does not have a game management plan?

Comm. Smith: I don't know. Of course, the thing with the states, is Hawaii is unique—

(public): Hawaii is unique and it doesn't have one. However, and this is the mechanism of why you need to have one—

Comm. Smith: Well, we're also unique in the nature of our hunting program and the animals that we hunt—

(public): Right. But this is the reason why you have to have one, because a large amount of money that comes to your department comes from hunters across the country. Hawaii does not make the minimum for Pittman-Robinson, so you are being supported by hunters who—when they give their license tax money, their trust fund money—expect conservation and game management with protection and enhancement of the stocks to a sustainable level. As we heard from Shaya, one of the tools is a basic management plan—a count and a management plan—and 20 years dealing with this, you have to ask yourself: are traditional and customary hunting rights against federal law, when those rights are enhancing or protecting ungulates to the detriment of endangered species in a pristine environment? And I think—speaking from experience—the Department would say that that is an intrusion into the environment and those rights are not sacrosanct. Endangered species rights supersede native Hawaiian rights. Is that correct?

Comm. Smith: I don't believe that's correct. Honestly, I don't know, so I just won't comment on that.

Comm. Buchanan: Yeah, don't comment on that. Don't comment on that.

Comm. Smith: It's a pretty complicated thing you just laid out there.

Comm. Buchanan: Yeah, because I have my own comments, as a practitioner.

Unknown (public): Tom had some stuff here, but I'm taking away a little bit from that. I'm going to read something real short here: "Components of an effective wildlife management plan include: land management goals and objectives by priority." I see what administrator is saying, how can we even get beyond that goal when land management goals and objectives are set by priority, which is threatened and endangered species, and so far, it has higher priorities than our game animals. And the second one, a resource inventory—which is something the Department, I think, is trying to work on. Site-specific habitat improvement recommendations—but we can't then because that's enhancing, so we have to throw it out, right? And a schedule for conducting management practices, which is kind of what Lori was talking about, and a record-keeping and evaluation of management efforts and the impacts on wildlife habitat. I go back to the first one, and I'm stuck there, because it resonates with what the administrator said that, "What is the land management goals and objectives?" And by priority, why do we have to have a game management plan? The priority is already set.

Comm. Smith: Well, I support having plans, I'm just not sure that this overarching game management plan's the way to go. What I'd like to have is a plan for every single one of our forest reserves, for every one of our land management units. I think we should have a plan at that level. I think that is kind of the level to which I would like to see planning. I'm not sure this overarching—we've demonstrated that it's a big rock to push uphill, we've been working on it for ten years and we haven't really gotten anywhere. So, do we want to keep pushing the rock up the hill? Or do we want to say, "Let's focus on site-specific plans for an area that take into account all the resources in that area." So, our focus has been to try to

get plans for forest reserves, natural area reserves, wildlife sanctuaries, and those types of things. That's where our focus is on planning.

Chair Sabati: Any other comments?

Unknown (public): A core conservation concept in Hawaii is the ahupua'a, the place of the pig. A division that is—

Comm. Smith: Altar of the pig. Which is where'd you put your taxes for the ali'i, who'd go around and pick them up.

Unknown (public): It would seem in Hawaii that honoring and replacing the jurisdiction for the native game mammal, the pua'a, would be something that would be important for the State of Hawaii.

Comm. Smith: The native game mammal? I'm not sure what—

Comm. Buchanan: I'm sorry, we're having a side conversation, I apologize.

Chair Sabati: Okay, getting back. Administrator, we need to meet, original working group, which is here, we need to, maybe get—

Comm. Buchanan: I want to make a motion and then we can have a discussion. I move that we ask and we already did—

Comm. Ruidas: You never closed public testimony.

Comm. Buchanan: Oh, we didn't? Close public testimony.

Chair Sabati: Okay. Closing public testimony so we can move on.

Comm. Buchanan: Thank you, Commissioner Ruidas. I'd like to move that the working group on Hawaii Island reconvene to discuss the Big Island Game Management Plan in four meetings, just to come back with a preliminary report of where they are, and what needs to be done moving forward.

Chair Sabati: Any seconds?

Comm. Cremer: Yeah, I'll second.

Comm. Smith: Can I ask a question? I'm just saying: four, I think, is arbitrary. That's just a comment.

Comm. Buchanan: Does the administrator have a friendly amendment to that motion?

Comm. Smith: I would just suggest that we meet and determine a path forward. You can do four, whatever. It's not binding, anyway, so.

Chair Sabati: Yeah, that's true.

Comm. Buchanan: Okay, so ask the member of the public that was on the working group.

Chair Sabati: He wants to meet with the working group. Do you think the working group would be open to that?

Richard Hoeflinger (public): Yeah, there's not much left. Everybody died. The original working group would be you and me, Lodge—Roku is ill, he told me he didn't want to—and Tim Ohashi. That's all that's left.

Chair Sabati: And he's serious, the rest have passed on. That's how long it's been. So, I ask you not to laugh, because the members—we put a lot of time into this, we actually drove from all parts of the island to meet at Mauna Kea State Park, and we worked really hard on this plan, and we went out into the communities to get feedback from the hunters. It was a really big task that we took on, so I ask that you please do not laugh when we say the members have passed on. Because they dedicated their lives to putting this plan together. So, I hope you can understand our frustrations and emotions that we are running through, and I hope that we can move past this and get it working. And maybe bring some other people in to help us from the community who want to volunteer to come and get involved with this.

We'd really appreciate it. I believe, then, if you could maybe work with Mr. Smith and set up meeting dates to come together at the table for a meeting of the minds. Let's move forward and get this done.

Comm. Buchanan: Mr. Chair? I think it's too open. I would like a little bit more structure to that discussion, because what I don't want to happen is—since people already passed away that served in the initial, and we're all not spring chickens around here—I would like to at least have something more concrete, because I'm assuming that these documents are very large and voluminous, I'm just imagining it. In order to have a productive meeting, one would have to read the materials, which would be the old plan and the new plan. And then have some sense in their mind moving forward. I mean, to really have a productive meeting, you would have to know what transpired, the history and everything to see where you came from, and then you can say, "Okay, this is where we are." I don't think you can do that in one meeting, and I think we need a time-lapse in order for the working group to gain more members. I see Tony in here, I'd like him to be a part of that. I'd like Ryan to be a part of that, that's just from the community perspective. And anybody else that wants to throw in.

Comm. Smith: That's fine, I'll agree to four meetings.

Comm. Buchanan: And the timeframe of when they can start. And make sure, we humbly ask our awesome staff if they can provide those materials—old plan, new plan—to the working group members so they can digest all of that information before they meet.

Chair Sabati: What kind of timeframe are you looking at?

Comm. Buchanan: That's a good question.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): One thought that has served me well—and I'm probably the oldest person in this room, by far—the productivity of any meeting is generally inversely proportional to the number of people that attend. So, you don't want to get a huge group—you're going to get nothing. You're going to get everybody's opinion. We held twelve meetings in the two-and-a-half years that we worked on the game management plan, and I think the most we had at any meeting was six or seven people. You may want to put some kind of reasonable limit on your participation if you want to get anything out of it.

Comm. Buchanan: So, you're good with just you and John, and maybe Ryan and somebody else, meeting with da kine?

Richard Hoeflinger (public): Sure thing. Whoever you choose.

Comm. Buchanan: It's up to you guys. This is your game.

Richard Hoeflinger (public): Well, if you want to get any of the original people, I named them: it would be John, myself, Tom Lodge, Tim Ohashi. I think that's all that's left.

Comm. Buchanan: Okay. You guys see however you want to move forward with that.

Chair Sabati: Okay, so why don't the four of us get together, and—

Richard Hoeflinger (public): I have no problem with Ryan and Tony being part of this.

Tony Sylvester (public): I can't do that—I'll be honest with you guys—because I can't get past land management goals and objectives by priority. It's already stated out. There's nothing we can do with a game management plan, other than putting things in writing. If we can't enhance animals, basically on any level, we just have hunting.

Comm. Buchanan: So, why is the Department introducing game birds?

Comm. Smith: We don't talk about game birds much. A lot of the focus is on game mammals. We can do active management on game birds, and we do. That's an area where we can really make some—I think we have a really good game bird program.

Comm. Buchanan: It's not a true statement, is all I'm bringing up. That they do enhance game.

Tony Sylvester (public): But it's site-specific. Mauna Kea, Puu Waawaa, Puu Anahulu. You start getting into different areas, different restrictions, different species—it just doesn't end.

Comm. Smith: Well, that gets back to my point of site specificity in planning.

Tony Sylvester (public): We have to take each site specific and apply a game management plan to that particular—they look at all the other obstacles that they have, threatened/endangered species, habitat conservation plans, whatever other things going on there—

Comm. Buchanan: But that's the overarching plan. Within that we have sub-area plans.

Tony Sylvester (public): But the outcome is, you already know you can't. If an animal is eating a plant in there, we can't do anything to enhance that animal, and we have just what we have right now—open for hunting.

Comm. Buchanan: Okay, we're going to have to have that discussion when you're part of the working group. Because I respectfully disagree.

Tony Sylvester (public): I'm just throwing it out there, so you think about that.

Chair Sabati: Anybody else? Commissioners? What time are your flights?

Comm. Buchanan: Maybe a show of hands: who's leaving today?

Chair Sabati: Who's flying out today?

Comm. Buchanan: Everybody. What time do you guys have to be at the airport? 6:00, 3:00, 4:45.

Comm. Smith: Well, we're pretty close, huh? That's all the heavy stuff, we're looking at a schedule going forward, and announcements and adjournment! We can do that in the next fifteen minutes!

Comm. Buchanan: Okay, order. We're not on a break, sorry. We're going to wrap up at least this game commission. Commissioner Ruidas, I heard you ask the chair.

Comm. Ruidas: Yeah, so set a timeframe to this thing: maybe the first workshop with the working group finished in two months, before our next meeting, so that they could give a report. And then go from there, how many sessions or meetings are you going to have after that.

Chair Sabati: I think that's a good idea.

Comm. Ruidas: So, set the first one first.

Chair Sabati: Okay. You agree with that, Richard? The suggestion from the commissioner was, within two months we have the first meeting, so within two months we can report back to the commission.

Richard Hoeflinger (Public): Whatever you all want to do.

Chair Sabati: Any other comments before we move on? All right, moving on.

ITEM 8. A short report from each commissioner summarizing their meetings with DOFAW staff on the island that they represent.

Chair Sabati: Why don't we start on your side?

Comm. Jury: On Oahu, we've had very successful meetings in transparency and communication between us and the wildlife manager, and DOFAW in general. Just continuing to get updates, but otherwise things are going well. They keep us in the loop. I think early on, like I said last year in June, they talked about certain acquisitions that are coming up, and they're keeping us on that timeline, moving forward to provide more hunting areas on Oahu, as well as having an open door and open dialog for input from the hunting community, and also looking at certain areas where the hunting community

can assist. Just overall: I think for our report, communication has been going really well. We're happy that Oahu has a wildlife biologist that just got brought on last month, so that's going to help lead the discussion going forward with the commission as well as the hunting community. And of course, the wildlife and forestry managers support hunting in other areas that are not necessarily the direct PHA, and moving forward in acquisition and talking to other landowners because of landlocks. All this discussion we're just kind of in the loop—so we've been told this, and we're always up to speed on what's going on, as well as helping to support if we find certain areas that we'd be able to access and maybe do some control work. I think the overall communication and transparency between the commission, DOFAW, and the hunting community on Oahu is only growing and getting better.

Chair Sabati: Nancy?

Comm. Timko: I concur.

Comm. Cremer: I represent Kauai. For me, I think communication between us and Lindsey's folks is pretty good now. I like it. Lindsey calls me on occasion, I call him. Some things we're working on: trying to improve the Wailua GMA—the bird management area—enhance the place, maybe put birds there, like I was doing on Koke'e. The Unit A lease, the last I talked to him was September. I don't know if maybe they met with Hawaiian Homes as far as the lease being extended. I know they were trying to work on a ten-year lease for certain sections, and they wanted to give them a five-year lease in another section. Then Lindsey's guys have been working on doing archery hunts, trial basis which will be in areas that have never been hunted before, which were totally shut off to hunting. We're starting with the Sleeping Giant, which is Nounou Mountain, and doing six months trial basis—hopefully going start at the beginning of April. Trying to get up the signs and get together with the hunters as far as rules and regulations, put up boundaries. Looking at opening other sections, probably the GMA for archery during the non-bird hunting season, which I think is excellent, because the archery hunters on the east side don't have a place where they can hunt, they have to travel far. I talked to Lindsey about Camp 10/Sugi Grove road, he referred me to Parks. I talked to the Parks guy over on Oahu as far as the road being damaged and not getting fixed. I guess Lindsey's boss said that's not their road to fix, that's Park's road. I don't know if you guys can do some kind of communication—Lindsey's hands are tied. I talked to Parks, but they didn't get back to me yet. Other than that, I'm really satisfied, and I thank you, Lindsey. I appreciate the communication, which we never had before.

Comm. Smith: Where's that road? Koke'e?

Comm. Cremer: Koke'e. The section where they just fixed those three bridges, just beyond that, going up to the Alakai trailhead. You've got a big turn that is really bad that the hunters have been complaining to me about.

Comm. Smith: Okay. I can talk to the State Parks administrator about that.

Comm. Cremer: Yeah, I took a ride in there one week, and I just spent a week up there going around talking to the west side community to touch bases, and that was one of their main concerns. I went through there and it's pretty dangerous. We actually made the women and children get out of the truck to go past that area. Other than that, everything's good.

Chair Sabati: Thank you.

Comm. Kohatsu: East Hawaii. I haven't seen Joey in a while, but everything's good so far. We've got no new eradications, so no one's in my ear crazy yet. But I did however get to talk to DOCARE—they're doing an amazing job, definitely wrapping up their patrols and they're just super busy, catching a lot of

poaching, catching a lot of guns in the wrong areas. They've got the new shooting area going on at the 16-mile marker, it's been used pretty well, but there have been some problems and things like that, but they're cleaning it up, trying to keep it all good. Other than that, pretty good.

Chair Sabati: That's it?

Comm. Kohatsu: That's it, yeah.

Chair Sabati: Okay. Jon Sabati, West Hawaii. I've been pretty busy, haven't had the chance to meet with Kanalu. He's been busy fighting fires and all the other stuff that's been going on in West Hawaii. I've been meeting with hunters on the west coast and tending to some medical concerns in my family. But meeting with resident and non-resident hunters, there's been concerns about hunting notices, tags, and so forth, and I had a brief discussion with Kanalu, so we're going to be working on remedying that situation. I made a suggestion on tags, Kanalu enlightened me telling me how much it cost to make tags. I was explaining to him how they do tags in the mainland, examples like the turkey tags. What they do is, you just print it out like you print out your license online, and it's the hunter's responsibility to attach it to the game they harvest. So, we're looking at improvements in some much-needed areas. We also talked about season announcements and having them updated, because they're over there in regulations—but if you look online, it's the old ones, not updated. So, working with DOFAW to get those updated, because if you look up game bird hunting rules, game mammal rules, look at the edition that was printed up—for example, the spring turkey one—you look it up, and it's March 1st to 31st, but now when it's released it's March 1st to April 15th. So, there's confusion, and we're looking at remedying that, and I think it's a simple fix. There's other concerns from the hunters, and I haven't had the chance to meet with Kanalu in his habitat. A lot of this fireweed is a big concern and how it affects game birds and game mammals. And I think we can move forward. I think it's a good thing. Kanalu's been really good with giving us information when requested, so we're looking forward to working more with him in the future. It's just that our area's so big, he's so busy, we're going to set some time to get it done.

Comm. Buchanan: Thank you, Chair. For the island of Molokai, since our last meeting I went and joined the Molokai Bowhunters Association, because they're the only group that has a formal group—part of the National Federation, so they're sanctioned. But they are an archery club—bowhunting—and they don't have any real issues, because Molokai Ranch actually gives them a space to do all of their hunting. So, they don't have any real big issues when it comes to hunting. I did attend one of their meetings recently, and they were discussing—they have tournaments, but that also lead to discussion about rogue tournaments that the community comes up with if they're either fishing, pig hunting, who has the biggest deer, all that kind of stuff. The consensus was amongst them that they really don't support that kind of hunting tournament. And it might be something if it gets to the point where it's impacting what they feel are their hunting areas, then they might want to look at doing something. I'm concerned because we don't have a Maui representative, so I called Shane recently and we had a really short discussion about that. So, I felt that I really needed to try to help the Maui DOFAW staff until we can rectify not having a Maui representative. That's why the first motion we made about rules and practices and procedures is really important, because this is an issue we need to address. If Maui's commissioner never came to a meeting, was sworn in but never attended, we don't have any rules in place to say, "Guess what? We need to go back to the governor and we need to get another commissioner." We don't have anything that says that we're authorized to do that—so, we need to write it. With that, Shane did share about the Kanaio project—obviously something that he has been floating for centuries, but I

don't know—so I called the project manager of SWCA, Francis Quitazal. I got some maps, I familiarized myself with the project, and I'm also aware of what's blowing up now in social media with the Kahikinui project—now I guess I switched from Molokai reporting to Maui, we can tag team because we're part of Maui Nui! There's a lot of misinformation out there on social media with the Kahikinui project. I understand they're having a community meeting next week Wednesday. It also includes the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands. DHHL is just starting to get proactive, because us old guys—we're not on social media, we're not on Instagram and Twitter and Facebook—so there's a lot of cyber bullying I'm aware of that is transpiring on the project. It was on the news last night, anybody see it on the news last night? Okay, it was on the news, Ben Gutierrez reported on it. So, it's definitely an issue that's quickly developing. I talked to the lead person in charge of the Kahikinui project, or the contractor that was hired—Jake Muise—talked to him last night, and they're aghast, they're really shocked, because this is a community. It involves Hawaiian Home Lands, and has the designation of being a kuleana place, the first designation by Hawaiian Homes, and the community decided to protect their forest. They decided that they were going to manage it—that's my understanding—and they went out and asked a private entity to do that versus the Department to do that. I could be right or I could be wrong, but I wanted to raise that. Other than that, there's just the regular stuff going on, but we also talked about the impacts of deer, because Molokai and Maui have got plenty of deer. They're impacting farmers. My biggest complaint on Molokai is farmers being impacted by deer, from the ag perspective. And in Monsanto, in their fields, they all took the proactive stance that they were going to deer fence all of their thousands of acres in, which they did, or are doing. So, that's about it. We're forming a working group to include NRCS, water conservation, USDA, farmers, and then hunters, and we'll try to work through that, and then we'll let you guys know what our plan is. Thank you.

Comm. Ruidas: So, Lanai report. First of all, I agree with Lori: we're part of Maui Nui, but we're getting calls from Maui telling what kind of stuff is going on over there, problems that they have. I don't want to step on the Maui guy's toes. But anyway. So, the three things we talked about with Shane De Mattos—I had said that in the last meeting on January 17th, page 25 and 26 in the minutes—so the first one was the archery extension, one more day to the archery week. So, it gives the hunters two weekends of opportunities for hunting. Second one was the lease. So, it passed, and they extended the lease for three years until February of 2018, in which they have to make a management plan, and I believe Shaya and Jim went to Maui and had a meeting with Pūlama, and they told me that you were there, and they were there, and you guys collaborated, I guess. And we need to do that to get a ten-year lease, and we have less than three years to do it now. The third one was the Mouflon. We have strong concern about the Mouflon season, the quality of the herd that we have there. I had a meeting with the hunters on the 6th of March, and I haven't gotten to get all the full details written out yet, in which time I'll formulate that and talk to Shane on that. Oh, and there's deer season right now, so everybody is really busy hunting and shooting animals.

Chair Sabati: Thank you. Any questions? Comments? Okay, none. Moving on.

ITEM 9. Updates on commissioner's terms expiring and funding for GMAC past 6/30/2018.

Comm. Buchanan: That would be Shaya?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): So, there are two commissioners' terms coming to an end on June 30th of this year: Jon Sabati and Stan Ruidas. I received a letter from commissioner Ruidas, but I didn't receive one from Chair Sabati.

Chair Sabati: Because I have some medical concerns in my family, I'm actually visiting the doctor tomorrow. So, the decision will be made tomorrow and you'll be getting a letter from me.

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): Okay, so I contacted Shannon Ibara and she gave me the deadline of February 28th.

Chair Sabati: Oh, so I missed the deadline.

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): Yes. If there were commissioners who wanted to stay on and continue, she wanted the commissioners to submit a letter. And then if you weren't continuing, then if you had suggestions for other commissioners, you could suggest that before the deadline, which was the 28th of February, as well. I can contact her again and bring it up and see if there is anything we can do about the deadline, but I'm not 100% sure.

Chair Sabati: Okay, just let me know.

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): Yes. And then for the letter from Stan Ruidas: he would like to continue for another year, and that was written in the letter, and I personally brought that letter to Shannon Ibara.

Chair Sabati: What about the funding?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): So, this item was brought up by Commissioner Timko, what we are going to do about funding for GMAC past June 30th, because we have funding until June. And the answer to that question: I do not know. The one option is probably Wildlife Revolving Fund, but we need to talk about that. Just for your information, the cost per meeting is about \$1,500.

Comm. Buchanan: Sorry, I have one question on the budget. So, on the budget, where are we at? Are we okay, not okay, we have to ask for money from someplace else?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): No, on the current budget, we're actually really good. The commission should spend more money.

Comm. Buchanan: Oh, okay! Well, we never had lunch yet—no, I'm just joking.

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): I have done the accounting, but I need to go back and doublecheck it because some of the coding strings were incorrect. So, I need to make sure that that's the case, but I believe an estimate: we've used somewhere between \$7,000 to \$10,000. I believe it's more around \$7,000.

Comm. Buchanan: Okay, thank you.

Chair Sabati: Okay, moving on. We actually moved ITEM 2, so we'd like to get back to that.

ITEM 2. (MOVED UP) Action Required: Approval of minutes from Jan. 17, 2018 GMAC meeting.

Comm. Buchanan: I wanted to ask that something be taken out of the minutes, Mr. Chair. The item was on page 6, and at the end Andrew Choy from Hunter Education was presenting, and he made a statement. I consider the statement hearsay, so I wanted it stricken from the record. He said, and I quote, "I'll just add, though, if you look at hunter incidents that have happened within the last five to ten years in Hawaii, most of the fatalities, they've been with experienced hunters." I didn't see anything to validate that statement, so I'd like that statement to be stricken from the record.

Comm. Smith: I don't think you can strike things from the record.

Comm. Buchanan: Why not?

Comm. Smith: Because the record just reflects what happened at the meeting, it doesn't mean it was accurate or not. It's just, that's what was said. So, I think the minutes should reflect what was said.

Comm. Buchanan: But this is draft minutes.

Comm. Smith: I know, but the minutes reflect what happened at the meeting, not whether you think they're correct or not, whether you agree with the statement or not. I don't think you can strike things like a direct statement from the minutes just because you don't think it was an accurate statement.

Comm. Buchanan: This is a legal record.

Comm. Smith: And that is what was said in the meeting.

Comm. Buchanan: Yes, Shaya?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): I completely agree, you can't just strike things off of the record. But what you can do is contact Andrew and make sure he made that statement.

Comm. Buchanan: How about I give feedback on the agenda item, which is adoption of the minutes? I will do so on the record. That's going to be part of the record of the minutes of this meeting. Okay? So again, feedback. Mr. Chair: page 6 of January 17th draft minutes, Andrew Choy, Hunter Education Program, stating that "the hunter incidents that have happened within the last five years in the state of Hawaii were by experienced hunters." Unless I see valid proof of that, I would disagree with that statement. He goes on to expound, just arbitrarily talking about different cases where people have died. So that's one, and there's another one. I want to state on the record: it looks like, from the minutes, that at some point in time, the beginning of the meeting started off with no quorum, and at some point on time that moved to have quorum, so you could be legal in taking votes. So, I did want to mention that. There's no distinction, but on the record, administrator says, "We can't do this, we have no quorum." Again, at that point it looks like Administrator Smith was kind of running the meeting, because I see him jumping in, and for the record, I don't think that the agency should be running the Game Management Commission meetings. That's why it's important for practices and procedures to be done for this, because we advise the agency—this is not the agency's commission, this is the hunters' commission.

Comm. Smith: But the agency is on the commission, and there was no one else there: you didn't have a Chair, you didn't have a Vice Chair.

Comm. Buchanan: Yes, we did not, and that's why I said it's important for us to have rules that have that distinction.

Comm. Smith: Yes. That'd be great. I just filled in because there was no one else there to do it. I was trying to run the meeting in an efficient fashion, I wasn't trying to guide anything.

Comm. Buchanan: I know that, but it seems like what happened to me is that it got contentious. And I think it wouldn't have gotten contentious if the agency wasn't running the meeting. That's my observation. So, it looks like it got a little bit contentious because you had a considerable amount, or at least more than five people, from the public testifying.

Comm. Smith: My statement on that would be that it got contentious because people were trying to talk about things that weren't on the agenda, and I was saying, "This is a commission meeting, it's controlled by an agenda, you can't just talk about whatever you want." So, I was telling people they couldn't talk about anything they wanted, they needed to stick to the agenda, and they got upset about that. I'm sorry, but I think that's a legitimate way to run a meeting. It's not just stream of consciousness, whatever you want to talk about—there needs to be an agenda item. That's when people got mad, and

one of the guys who got really mad—I actually let him go on for a long time, a few more minutes and DOCARE would've shown up and taken him out of there. There was nothing on the agenda about what he was talking about.

Comm. Jury: May I say something? One: he's right, he did ask us about the meeting. We felt we weren't comfortable running the meeting—or the commissioners that were there—so he did ask before he started to run the meeting. Two was that: the response from the community at the January 17th meeting, it only came out from community input when we moved to the item of a short report from each of the commissioners. So, when Oahu did report on the update of what's going on with the feral goat situation, then the community came in after that. But in terms of why the meeting was being run by Administrator Smit, it's because at the time, I felt like that was our best option.

Comm. Ruidas: I think on page 21, if you look when Commissioner Kohatsu enters, then we have a quorum, so we should input "quorum was present." And yeah, that day was action, yeah?

Comm. Buchanan: Yeah, action. Commissioner Jury, is there anything else that happened in the meeting that we should be aware of for the members that weren't able to be there? And I apologize, because I wasn't there, Chair wasn't there, Cremer wasn't there.

Comm. Smith: Can I mention that the one guy who got really mad—and was just going off on me—was mad because we had it on that day, which was the commemoration day, which you requested that we meet that day? So, I took quite a bit of flak from that guy for having it that day, when in fact it was you who requested that day, and you weren't there! So, I took some arrows for you, I just want you to know.

Comm. Cremer: It actually was me, too!

Comm. Buchanan: Well, just to clarify, we set our date before the march people set their date.

Comm. Smith: I'm not saying I have any problem with that, I'm just saying that some people in the public had issues with why we chose that day.

Comm. Buchanan: I see that they had issues with that. That's the only thing, I think it's just better that the commission work within ourselves to try to keep that, because we already know that most of this stuff is already contentious, and that's why we sit here, and we're just trying to be that buffer in a really structured way to be helpful and work together. That's okay, I'm going to let the rest go.

Chair Sabati: Okay, any other comments? Okay, so, motions? Motion for approval of the minutes.

Comm. Ruidas: You need a motion to amend it.

Comm. Buchanan: Me? I cannot because I wasn't at the meeting. I just commented on the minutes. I'm going to abstain, because I'm not sure if I should be voting on the minutes when I wasn't there.

Commissioner Ruidas moves to accept the minutes from the January 17th, 2018 GMAC meeting with the amendment of "quorum was present after Commissioner Kohatsu entered." Commissioner Kohatsu seconds. All in favor, except Commissioner Buchanan, who abstains. Motion carries.

ITEM 10. Set future meeting schedule and potential Agenda items.

Comm. Cremer: Where is the next meeting? Is it Kauai? Is the meeting in Kauai?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): I think we should do it like we did last time. So, if it's going to be on Kauai, we should talk to the staff about where we're going to do it, and what the available dates are before we set the actual meeting date. But maybe we should say, "Okay, which month? Is it going to be April,

May?” Just choose one month, and I’ll look into it. Give me a two-week period, and then I’ll send a couple of potential dates around.

Comm. Ruidas: So, we have funding for one or two more meetings?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): We have funding for another 20 meetings if you wanted to.

Comm. Cremer: So, we’re going to do two-day—you want a site visit on Kauai?

Comm. Buchanan: Is Commissioner suggesting that we go to Kauai?

Comm. Cremer: Yes.

Comm. Buchanan: Would it be a good idea to go after the Legislature closes, so we know what bills have transpired? This is already March. April? May? June?

Comm. Ruidas: Fourth week of May? You have to work on that report.

Comm. Cremer: Fourth week of May is good.

Meeting tentatively set for 4th week of May 2018.

Chair Sabati: Potential agenda items?

Comm. Buchanan: We can work on them like we always do—we have plenty that came out of the January 17th meeting—with the understanding that we’re going to have at least one report from the working group on the game management plan. One last thing: if I can ask staff—I suggest following up with Ibara on Chair’s not putting the letter in by the 28th. Can you see if they can waive that because of medical issues?

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): I will definitely look into it.

Comm. Buchanan: Okay, thank you.

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): My understanding is: you will let me know whether you would like to continue or not, and then I’ll contact Shannon.

Chair Sabati: I’m going to find out tomorrow, I have a doctor’s appointment tomorrow.

Shaya Honarvar (DOFAW): And for the agenda items, may I please request that when you email me the agenda items to be very, very clear what you would like to see on the agenda, as if you were writing the item. Sometimes I get one or two words from commissioners, and I can’t make up the agenda items. So, please write the agenda item as if it’s an actual item that you’d like to see on here, and then if I have some edits, we’ll communicate back and forth. And please try to get it to me at least a month before the meeting—some of it at least—so that we’re not at the last minute trying to figure out what goes on the agenda.

Comm. Buchanan: Mr. Chair, until we write our rules, I would like the practice to be that we send all of this stuff to Shaya, and then Shaya sends it to the Chair and Vice Chair, and you guys see that I always remind you not to talk about to each other on email, that’s a violation of Sunshine Law, so that’s why I always say, don’t respond to all. Everything goes to Shaya, Shaya distributes the information to us as commission members, yeah? You guys can talk to her, she’ll talk to us. All right.

Chair Sabati: Any announcements?

Comm. Buchanan: Thank you, Department of Land and Natural Resources and DOFAW!

Comm. Smith: Thanks to our staff!

Comm. Cremer: Thanks for sitting here all day.

Commissioner Ruidas moves to adjourn. Commissioner Buchanan seconds. All in favor. Motion carries.