

ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY COMMITTEE

June 13, 2017 MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Location: Kalanimoku Building, 1151 Punchbowl St. Room 322B; Honolulu, HI 96813

MEMBERS: Dr. Scott Fretz (DLNR), Dr. Jim Jacobi (USGS), Dr. Gordon Tribble (USGS), Michelle Bogardus (USFWS), Dr. Loyal Mehrhoff (At-Large), Dr. John Harrison (At-Large), Dr. Kimberly Burnett (UH)

ABSENT: None.

STAFF: DOFAW: Kate Cullison, Glenn Metzler, Emma Gosliner, James Cogswell, Marigold Zoll, Greg Mansker, Susan Ching,

USFWS: Jodi Charrier, Donna Ball, Darren LeBlanc

OTHERS: Paul Conry (HT Harvey), David Zippin (ICF), Mililani Browning (Kamehameha Schools), Ron Duke (H.T. Harvey), and Tiffany Agostini (TetraTech)

ITEM 1. Call to Order. Introductions

ITEM 2. Mahalo to John Harrison and welcome new members

Harrison read a prepared statement that can be used as an oral history of the Committee, and its inception. The testimony can be found in the Meeting Archives attached as a PDF.

Harrison commented that the other founding member (Jacobi) asked me to make some comments, where we are and where we're going. The consequential achievement not only in existing, functional, vibrant, and working habitat conservation plans, safe harbor agreements and incidental take permits is that each and every day in all of the species that are struggling to survive, we're speaking for them. We watched what was essentially an advisory committee transform itself into the motivator, organizer and principled entity for an entirely directed program of new scientific research and knowledge. The workshops we've held, the outputs from those activities have and continue to have amazing benefits. Generally environmental management is a slow process and expensive, and I charge all of you to have the same vision that Doak Cox had as we go forward. The interface between science and government in this day and age is a troubled one, but the principles in which we are working are worth fighting for.

Jacobi stated that we have come a long way since the first meeting that also included Paul Conry, a lot of it has been because of the members who has served on the committee. John has been an exemplary member, with his knowledge and expertise regarding legislative process and administrative rules has been a key part of how we've been able to understand the concepts of the role of the ESRC. To separate biology and policy has been a key part in how he's grown as a committee member and I look forward to future meetings where you come in as a member of the public. Thank you, John.

Paul Conry commented on John's history with the committee. Our responsibility as a committee is to administer the law and making it work. John really was a valuable member knowing the history and balance and how to move forward and where it can go.

Mehrhoff stated that the contribution that you, and the whole committee has had, when you look at Hawaii there are things that stand out and this committee is one of those, when you look at the other states, they don't have nearly the amount of coordination and interaction between federal and state agencies, really is groundbreaking.

Fretz presented Harrison with the committee's first award State of Hawaii Endangered Species Recovery Committee in appreciation for its member John Harrison for your vision and guidance for the recovery of Hawaii's threatened and endangered species.

Jacobi recommended that Harrison's written testimony be appended to the minutes for this meeting since it was testimony submitted officially.

Fretz introduced the committee's newest member, Loyal Mehrhoff serving the remainder of Eric Vanderwerf's term.

ITEM 3. Approval of Minutes

Jacobi motioned to approve minutes for June 9, 2016, September 28, 2016, November 1 and 2, 2016, and December 8, 2016. Jacobi appreciated the efforts put in to documenting the minutes and recommended the addition of action statements or items that staff is going to do, to be put at the bottom of the minutes as an action line to review. He would like to see it also separated out, in a summary outside of the minutes. Would like action items from previous meetings highlighted and compiled to go over at the next ESRC meeting.

Fretz called to approve all minutes. Minutes are approved.

ITEM 5. Approval of Kamehameha Schools Safe Harbor Agreement

Metzler and Browning gave an overview presentation and PowerPoint for KS SHA.

Jacobi asked for more clarification regarding silviculture strategies KS plans on implementing. Browning explained that KS has different silviculture strategies, in the lower area outside Forest Bird Stratum 1 there is more of a plantation approach to planting because it is primarily open pasture land. These areas were planted about 30 years ago, actions to supplement those stands include potentially trimming to promote better biodiversity and invasive species control for native species to return.

Jacobi asked about the expansive harvest cycle. Browning responded that KS wants to harvest koa in the future, about 50 years out with minimal trimming actions sooner than that. Any large scale or more intensive harvest is decades away, and will never be clear cut, and it will always be selective. In the upper area, selective trimming is used to promote biodiversity. KS reserves the right to harvest for cultural reasons, but at this time there are no intentions to do any kind of commercial harvesting in the area in Forest Bird Stratum 1.

Mehrhoff commented that inside of Forest Bird Stratum 1, Browning noted that there are no plans to harvest inside, but SHA says you will not.

Ball responded that there are avoidance and minimization measures built in that are specific to Forest Bird Stratum 1 for impact to any activity during breeding seasons. Selective harvest and larger rotation is more focused in the area outside of Stratum 1. There are a certain number of trees allowed over a 10 year period, size of trees is spelled out in the document. Not just allowed, but enforcement measures built in to reduce the impact. Bogardus commented in respect to the forest health aspect, harvest of koa is restricted to two of the large koa trees every ten years. Browning noted that harvest is allowed but defined the amount and type and minimization measures around the harvest actions allowed.

Donna Ball presented on USFWS Steps to approval. After sending in the RO package, Ball does not anticipate substantial comments from RO and solicitor. After RO and solicitor office review and comment, the field office will receive revisions and SHA can be signed at the field supervisor level at the Honolulu office.

Frtez asked if there are any additional comments or questions from the committee.

Mehrhoff asked about the species of *Vicia* with a baseline of 27 plants. How do you get to recovery and can you delist with a potential to a baseline of 27.

Ball indicated it would be the creation of overall buffer of habitat provided for the species and its protection and enhancement of that habitat. Right now the landowner is willing to do more outplanting and propagule collection and raising *Vicia* so it can be planted in the future. We hope over the life of the agreement we will see an enhancement of the species, and will also be able to be outplanted in other areas in its historical range. We wouldn't have propagules for this species for restoration without the KS enhancement. There are still unknown aspects of the plant such as understanding the pollination lifecycle, and this could offer the ability for researchers to study the species.

Mehrhoff asked if the official baseline is a number. Ball clarified that USFWS is not the enforcement entity for plants, but is taking an approach in protecting the area, but the State is the entity for plant baseline enforcing take of the plant species. The 27 individuals baseline agreed to in 2008, that's where the number originated, trying to build a provision to protect plants on a larger scale based on historic range.

Bogardus stated that the SHA goes out of its way to ensure that all impacts are completely avoided by adding special protective measures. Under the SHA the applicant can return to baseline conditions at the end of the agreement, it does not allow for removal of the covered species. There is a plus side for Keauhou within the area of Forest Bird Stratum 1 and the area of additional protective measures because baseline conditions in that habitat are already so high, so that if KS decided to return to baseline conditions, they are such that they support the recovery of the covered species in that area already. The risk associated with that is relatively low in that section of the property.

Mehrhoff asks if it's possible to get to recovery at baseline conditions.

Bogardus responded that the habitat at baseline conditions support recovery. Recovery of the species exceeds just what this habitat can support but it is a piece.

Ball added that recovery of the species can't happen without this piece as it is the crucial for the rest of the opportunity.

Mehrhoff asked about anticipation of salvage logging, in response to ohia or die off of koa within Forest Bird Stratum 1.

Browning responded that it primarily would be for maintenance of access routes and fences, so would be collecting logs obstructing fences. Should there be an outbreak of ROD in this area our response is to proceed with the best recommendations developed at the time. KS does not have a definite response action, and it would also be guided by restrictions of the SHA, and would be limited in our response. There would be no commercial salvage logging. Estimated frequency of thinning is in the document.

Mehrhoff expressed concern about salvaging since there is not a lot of study on impact of salvage logging in Hawaii but that mainland salvaging research has shown a lot of negative effects.

Jacobi mentioned that KS may need to change that word, because salvage has different implications and is not KS' intention.

Fretz asked what the relevant term would be. Salvage does not necessarily imply commercial use. Mehrhoff asked just make it clear no commercial salvage logging would occur and expressed concern about the low baselines.

Browning responded that the integrity of fence lines or primary access points are the main things we would remove logs for, for safety reasons. We take them to an area for cultural use, we know logs contribute to the ecosystem health, and value the presence of dead and dying logs in the ecosystem. The purpose and intention is not to salvage for commercial use.

Fretz asked the committee if they are suggesting that an amendment is needed to clarify, or if they are alright with the way it is written. Mehrhoff said he would like to see it clarified, and expressed concern about the future that would make it damaging to the area to do large scale salvaging. Browning asked Mehrhoff if he had a concern about expressly stating that we would not ever sell any of the logs, in the case of a big event happening

Jacobi said that over the course of 50 years if a major event happens, that's something that could come back to the committee for resolution, and that will probably happen. Part of the adaptive management strategy, if major (unforeseen) event happens such as ROD comes in the area, plan that you had has changed. Ok we need to come back and potentially modify.

Tribble suggested terminology for roads and fences could be infrastructure as opposed to commercial extraction. This agreement has been a long time coming will be a gold standard. Having things in there that could be unspoken between trusts and partners should be in the agreement because some other entity might want to use same template, and ask why KS did not have to specify but we do.

Mehrhoff said the way the net benefit is laid out in SHA doesn't seem overly compelling. He suggested including in term of acreage what things are right now versus what it would be at the peak of conservation, and what it will go back to. What is it going to look like when it goes to baseline? Laying that out, gives a better view of what the actual benefits are because it will tell you that you are getting an increase in habitat but it does not tell you how much. That would help do that and help people understand that when you go back to baseline there is still a net benefit overall. Not sure if that needs an amendment but something I would expect in a document. Same thing for the three special plants in particular.

Metzler asked if we do have these baselines specified here (in the PowerPoint) should we put in some language that states that would be something about those numbers.

Mehrhoff stated that at end of the day 50 years later you go back to the baseline, but some of that stuff is probably not going to go back especially in the bird area. You are probably going to have more than that many acres that's going to be in conservation. Bogardus clarified what Mehrhoff was asking for something that needs to be well illustrated in the document. We need to paint the pictures that this is what it is now, this is what it will be at the height of the benefit and what it will go back to.

Ball said they discussed this with legal. Baselines are set for a reason in safe harbor agreements. How much we project in the future, in concrete acreage or to what extent KS is held to their baseline; we did have those conversations.

Mehrhoff stated that the baseline for *Vicia* is inadequate for the site. If that's what you are going to go by, then you cannot go forward with this. You can have a baseline or requirement of the SHA that is above baseline, but you need to explain what the potential is, or why is it a benefit. If it is just going back to the baseline then there is not benefit. There is no net benefit at the end of 50 years.

LeBlanc stated that in a safe harbor agreement, you have to allow them to go down to baseline. There have to be benefits from the actions that are dealing with the covered species through the course of the action if they ever decide to bring it back to baseline. That is what the safe harbor allows.

Mehrhoff said he did not think safe harbors were intended for this and felt like this was more of an HCP. If there is not any habitat in those areas or something along those lines, he did not see the net benefit to the species.

Ball said that they anticipate that [habitat] improvement over time which is why there is intensive monitoring of species to make sure the populations are being maintained over the years and modelling every 10 years.

Browning said that in the overlay baseline for multiple species covered you will see great habitat improvement. While the baseline for *Vicia* is 27 we have corresponding baseline for other species in area that will improve as a whole and that will improve habitat for *Vicia* as well.

Fretz said that the safe harbor lays out why they believe that a net recovery benefit will be achieved by this safe harbor agreement, and asked Mehrhoff if he is suggesting to more specifically identify net benefit expressed in number of plants and not just habitat.

Mehrhoff responded that he is ok with expressing it in terms of habitat, but he is not seeing where the net benefit is in this SHA. Fretz said that staff and applicant need to demonstrate why there is a recovery net benefit while being allowed to return back to baseline at some point in the future.

Jacobi said in our other SHAs the baselines are based on the number of individuals, at the end of the project they have the ability to bring it back to that number. Net benefit has been estimated during the course of the SHA when management was going on there were benefits that came out, that those benefits then we able to be used through additional breeding stock, or genetic diversity, those were considered to be the net benefits. I see the same thing here, an implied net benefit during the duration of the plan. Once they join SHA they are not going to bring it back to baseline, they will have extra added value that comes out of it. Maybe we need to be a lot clearer in terms of how we're looking at net benefit, it is a difficult concept to spell out.

Mehrhoff requested more precise, clearer explanation of where you're going to get a net benefit during that interim period. As long as you maintain baseline, permit holder can do those management actions.

Bogardus stated that the Service looks at the status quo of the enrolled property as a whole, and we recognize in that document that without management the quality of habitat is downwards procession. Even by maintaining the baseline within it in itself seeing a net benefit itself over the course of a few years, because should there be no weed control or maintenance of ungulate fences, the quality of habitat would quickly degrade.

Browning included that especially in Forest Bird Stratum 1 the covered activities are educational or ecosystem management actions. The covered activities work to benefit species, but wouldn't be able to do those without the agreement.

Mehrhoff responded that these are the kinds of things I would weave into the agreement. Bogardus stated that the increase of forest bird habitat as a result of the activities would be an additional 1600 acres over the course of the agreement, and then increases in quality of the existing habitat in Forest Bird Stratum 1.

Mehrhoff asked if the return to baseline would be the restored area that is not already in old growth conditions - that would be the part that would be possibly harvested, after you return to baseline.

Bogardus clarified that existing habitat would be increased in value that would not ever return to baseline. Outside of that would be the 1600 acres that would be subject to harvest with a maximum of 200 acres on a rotational basis. Ball included that some of that would not be harvested because the life of the agreement is 50 years.

Mehrhoff asked if any of the areas currently occupied are subject to return to baseline. Ball responded that it does not return to baseline, we are starting at 4,162 acres and have the expectation that it will continue to increase over the life of the agreement. Mehrhoff stated that if it is not returning back to baseline then clearly define the benefit. Will make it clearer and cleaner in the BO.

Fretz said that it was mentioned earlier about recovery work for *Vicia*, and that the population may serve as a source for that. For other species that represents a propagation outside the source area in a way that there still is a net benefit.

Fretz is still concerned about removing trees from salvage. How to adjust the language? Committee is being asked to recommend approval for the BLNR. He suggested to approve the agreement based on staff review of removal or language clarification in there.

Jacobi commented that the intent was not for commercial salvage harvest, I think the discussion solved that. It is just a minor clarification in the text.

Metzler suggested language no commercial salvage unless approved by DOFAW. Browning stated that KS cannot commit to that, we would never sell any of those trees that were removed for safety and access areas. Conry suggested using language such as stewardship salvage, stewardship harvest, done to enhance environment. Mehrhoff suggested wording similar to salvage to maintain roadways to protect facilities and hazards. Those trees may or may not be sold commercially.

Fretz suggested the purpose of removing trees was for stewardship and management and the clarification could be removal of trees for purposes consistent with management and safety. Staff will confirm that it is written.

Jacobi stated that this agreement is setting a precedent for how we approach SHAs in the future especially with non-zero baselines. Looking forward to annual updates on progress of it.

Harrison motioned for approval as proposed to be amended by staff. Jacobi seconded the motion. Fretz asked if there were any public comments. There were none.

Fretz motion for approval. Approved.

ITEM 4. Update on *Abutilon menziesii* HCP

Metzler presented a PowerPoint on *Abutilon* and that the implementation of the HCP has moved to the Oahu District Branch with Susan Ching.

Jacobi did not feel comfortable using the word “unrealistic” in terms of meeting the success criteria and said it was not an excuse as to why they were not met. It also downplayed the effort that went in to come up with success criteria.

Fretz said staff was trying to find out the technical process in which any money was lost or account closed, or if the legislature took the funds, or eliminated the ceiling. Part of the anticipated funding process. Fretz replied that the legislature zeroing out the funds means the funds still might be there, but actually moving the funds to the General Fund is a different thing.

Bogardus asked if there was any information on whether success is relative in difference to management application, or is that just the same management at all sites and there has been any success at any. Metzler said he wasn't sure, that was a question for Mansker.

Zoll shared the Oahu district's perspective since things have changed in regard to *Abutilon* and the HCP. The district is more open to incorporating management of *Abutilon* into ongoing management, we should take advantage of it and incorporate it into our normal operations. There is also a new initiative opportunity with community groups or Malama Hawaii to help take off the work load especially at the Contingency Reserve Area (CRA). She mentioned that it is still a challenge to meet the goals of the HCP in the timeframe we have.

Jacobi commented that of the goals were laid out, will they be met? If not, what are we going to do about that? In terms of restoration strategy and ability to get there, since that time we had a site visit, he is looking at restoration sites differently. During the site visit he did not think the Diamond Head and Kahuku sites were working, and thought there was similar consensus. Ideas between Greg, Rick Barboza, and Butch Haase included moving away from monoculture to more of a mix. He did see a possibility at Hamakua Marsh even though it was outside of the historical range. He is not seeing those thoughts reflected in Metzler's presentation, and that we are in a real precedent-setting stage in this project. Jacobi expressed concern in terms of compliance aspect and restoration strategy for the HCP.

Zoll said she has been working to nail down DOFAW's control of CRA in perpetuity because it is pretty much the only manageable wild site on the island. DHHL does not want to get involved in endangered species management in this location. Her intention is to make it a wildlife sanctuary for *Abutilon*, rare dry forest plants, and pueo in collaboration with Malama Learning Center and volunteer workforce. Jacobi agreed that the CRA was the most important site.

Mankser commented that the CRA is the most threatened site due to urbanization, and there has been more pressure on that site over the years. Of all the sites on the island he did not think DOFAW should be putting all the resources into that one site.

Fretz asked Zoll if there is a recovery plan for the species that's at the implementation plan level. He wanted to know if there was anything specific enough to identify sites and population targets.

Mankser said the recovery plan is based on a FWS Lanai plan that was not based on really data, but instead of an idea of what constitutes a population over a given amount of time.

Fretz asked Zoll what her vision and plans are for the recovery of the species. Zoll said is planning on continuing to manage known sites as a high priority, focusing on high conservation efforts overlapping management and longevity. Hamakua Marsh, despite being out of the historic range, is a wildlife sanctuary, there's a lot of habitat restoration and can incorporate *Abutilon* because DOFAW will be working in that area for the long term, and can incorporate the community to help with site feasibility.

Bogardus said it might be worth sitting down and working out a 5-10 year implementation and recovery strategy what the recovery efforts will look like. All these factors probably won't weighed equally. From a recovery perspective really focusing on sites over the long term. Jacobi emphasized a more integrative approach, and thinks that is the new strategy to pursue.

Bogardus asked if the HCP described these possibilities of unforeseen circumstances. Jacobi and Mankser were not sure, but thought it might just mention a single sentence, and focus on adaptive management.

Ching commented that by focusing on the biology first, then to have a strategy of where to go. It's not going to meet the goals in the time remaining. If we start in a biological direction, then we can come up with a clearer, attainable goal over the next year. Jacobi agreed that we are not going to meet the goals of the HCP in the time remaining. That is an issue that needs to be addressed and how it relates to the committee.

Fretz asked staff to put together some recommendations for the committee, so the committee can see where it is going and how it meshes with the transition to the recovery.

Jacobi suggested looking at other islands and potential for restoration efforts on other islands. Would be open to that expansion and scoping. Mehrhoff said that there have been issues in the past with mitigation for plant species, which will be similarly problematic, putting this one on another island still leaves you with the other problems.

Jacobi suggested an action item DOFAW works internally with connections outside to develop a restoration strategy for *Abutilon*.

Zoll said she had also been talking about incorporating *Abutilon* into the landscaping of the housing sites. Collaborated with them to provide them with plants with genetic diversity as a potential repository. Jacobi said to be careful about hybridizing. Bogardus cautioned this idea even if the plants are used in a garden setting, they still have protections. Used as an ornamental in a parking lot and then they needed to change the parking lot, they have a regulatory burden.

Bogardus said that everyone sounded supportive of trying the biological strategy instead of trying to maintain the success criteria as written in the HCP. What is the mechanism that the committee can use to do that, is it through adaptive management, or modification or amendment to the HCP to redefine success criteria or is that is something to do after looking at strategy?

Jacobi commented that he would not put too much back on success criteria. The issue is the timeline to getting it to that state and what kind of context it is in, such as a monoculture. One of the challenges here it was not very clear that if you get to the end of the term and you haven't achieved it, then what. The

committee has been much clearer in subsequent HCPs. Potentially an amendment for timing, but it will not give us more money.

Fretz said that an amendment is hypothetical at this point. If this transition from the next four years to the ten years that follow, if it's logical to do something that is clearly seen as out of compliance with the HCP, but that makes biological sense, we are going to look at how we deal with that.

Zoll asked about getting clarity regarding the legal issues. Fretz said we need to run this by the AG whether they will be out of compliance. Zoll asked about a timeline for coming up with a strategy.

ACTION ITEMS: Legal questions to AG, Fretz said he would help with that, bring back as an agenda item for next meeting, with an update on the action items, should include basic elements of strategy and timetable for recovery plan.

Mehrhoff said that this HCP will only reach partial success, and asked how to transition to post HCP success, post dollars anyways, what's the best strategy and makes the most sense on Oahu. Mankser agreed and commented that they need to figure out how to move from HCP to DOFAW management.

Fretz asked if there were any public comments. There were none. Fretz asked if there were any staff comments. Zoll thanked the committee for helping staff move forward due to significant staff changes in past few months.

ITEM 6. Discussion of mitigation options for Hawaiian Stilts in Kona, Hawaii for Cyanotech HCP renewal

Cullison presented on mitigation sites for Hawaiian stilts in Kona. Charrier did site visits recently and will run through the options.

Kamehameha Schools ponds have a lot of predator presence such as goats. Variable fledgling success even with predator control.

Bogardus asked if DOFAW is still working on depredation permit for cattle egrets. Cullison said yes, the predominant predator for stilts is currently cattle egrets.

Fretz asked what the distance from the water treatment plant to the airport was. He commented that on Maui he has worked with USDA for cattle egret control, especially near Kanaha Wildlife Sanctuary. Since USDA is already permitted for it, they may be able to do the work for you, sooner. Bogardus said if it's within 5 miles of the airport then it is within their range. Cullison said that the cattle egrets are coming over from the National Park. Bogardus said the Park is seeking a depredation permit as well.

Cullison said that cattle egret control seems like a good mitigation option, but that it would be challenging to measure the benefit, because it would be benefitting the population instead of a given site. Most of the coastal sites are being monitored already, so it might be reflected in the annual count. What kind of leeway would the Committee would give for actions we know would have a benefit but may be hard to quantify, but done for a certain amount of time.

Bogardus asked if we can quantify the current impact. Cullison said there has been evidence of predation at the wastewater treatment plant. Fretz asked if the Park Service would be alright if we did predator control in the Park. Cullison said she thought the Park Service would be interested, and asked the

committee if cattle egret control a viable mitigation option. Fretz asked if the Park was doing any predator control. Cullison responded that they are now trapping for mongoose and cats.

Mehrhoff suggested to begin with terrestrial predator control and can up that to include avian control. Cullison agreed and said if we focus on a certain site for cats and cattle egrets, maybe Wildlife Services can work on those within the Park. Fretz said that the water treatment plant sounded like the best option. He said to plan out what is needed, set out a monitoring plan to quantify the benefit. Cullison noted that there has been some concern over trying to boost the population of birds in such a non-natural habitat. Jacobi said that the definition of habitat is a place to nest, feed and that is available at this site.

Bogardus said that there is no doubt that the wastewater treatment plant has the greatest potential to producing the highest number of birds, and adding avian control to existing management activities to boost the population, when looking at the whole of all of the locations for waterbirds on the Kona coast, it's not a numbers game it's a habitat game. They are so habitat-limited in where they can survive on that Kona coast population. Is it more important to produce more birds in this one highly modified place, or is it more important to protect what habitat remains so that the species can subsist there. She asked if the habitat can even support a higher number of individuals. Cullison said she asked, and that some of the birds went to Maui instead in search of more suitable habitat.

Mehrhoff said that Cyanotech is already an unnatural pond and habitat, and stated that the Park should pay for their own predator control. Bogardus said that if there is cattle egret control in any capacity, it would be ideal to time it all together with other sites so you're doing control at the same time. Cullison said there seem to be two main sites where the cattle egrets congregate, one is the Park and the other is the old airport.

Browning asked what the nestling success rate was at the wastewater treatment plant. Cullison replied that there were over 20 this year but there have been a lot of predation out of the 100 eggs.

Jacobi said there is another base of information, the original Cyanotech holding basin before they closed that down. That's where they were producing an unbelievable number of birds.

Fretz said it would be good to have a bigger picture of the habitats and sites across the region there in terms of their production. This might not be the best site if one of those is a sink and this is a source and all you have to do is management in the sink to prevent predation, it might be better to work in a different site.

Cullison proposed to bring for recommendation potential projects to get the most benefit for the small amount of money. Bogardus said she would check in on the status with Migratory Bird folks for the programmatic for barn owls and cattle egrets.

ACTION ITEM: Staff will work on a recommendation and will bring it back when there is something more concrete.

Bogardus said if the ESRC was heading back out to Kona for a site visit, may be worth a side trip to see the wastewater treatment plant.

Fretz asked if there were any public comments.

Browning asked if Cyanotech has another six month extension to develop a new mitigation plan. Cullison said Cyanotech had a year to come to an agreement with KS, which they did not, and now they have a year to get something in writing and presented. They were given that long because they were ahead in

their mitigation. The HCP is currently expired, but they initiated the extension/renewal discussion prior to expiration. They are continuing their other mitigating actions and the onsite minimization efforts.

ITEM 7. Announcements

Staff wanted to schedule more regular meetings scheduled in advanced quarterly so it is easier for applicants and consultants to predict when the next meetings are.

The fourth Thursdays of each quarter have been chosen for meeting dates beginning in January 2018. The 2018 quarterly meeting days will be January 25, April 26, July 26, and October 25 with additional meetings scheduled as needed and the annual two day review.

This September 2017, might be two full days of meetings with September 7 and September 14.

ACTION ITEM: Jacobi would like a status update on Lalamilo next meeting since the windmills are turning with no document in place. Would like to hear a presentation from the applicant and not just the contractor.

ITEM 8. Meeting Adjourned