

DRAFT Minutes of the Advisory Committee on Plants and Animals
October 28, 2022, Meeting
Hawaii Department of Agriculture (HDOA)

I. CALL TO ORDER

Advisory Committee on Plants and Animals (Committee) Chairperson Dr. Helmuth Rogg called the meeting to order on Friday, October 28, 2022, at 1:36 PM via Zoom meeting.

Members Virtually Present:

Dr. Helmuth Rogg, Committee Chairperson, HDOA
Dr. Maria Haws, Professor of Aquaculture, Pacific Aquaculture & Coastal Research Center, University of Hawaii at Hilo
Robert Hauff, State Protection Forester, Division of Forestry & Wildlife, Hawaii Department of Land & Natural Resources, Ex Officio Member Designated Representative
Gracelda Simmons, Environmental Management Program Manager, Hawaii Department of Health, Ex Officio Member Designated Representative
Thomas Eisen, Planner, Environmental Review Program, Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism, Ex Officio Member Designated Representative
Ryan Pe'a, Wildlife Biologist, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Dr. Samuel Ohu Gon III, Senior Scientist and Cultural Advisor, The Nature Conservancy – Hawaii

Others Virtually Present:¹

Jodi Yi, Deputy Attorney General (DAG)
Jonathan Ho, Inspection & Compliance Chief, PQB, HDOA
Chris Kishimoto, Entomologist, PQB, HDOA
Kevin Salvador, IT Specialist, HDOA
Jason Azus-Richardson, IT Specialist, HDOA
Stephanie Easley, Legal Fellow, Coordinating Group on Alien Pest Species
Darcy Oishi, Acting Manager, Plant Pest Control Branch (PPC), HDOA
Wilfred Leon Guerrero, Microorganism Specialist, PQB, HDOA
Delanie Prescott-Tate, DAG
Suzanne Shriner, President, Kona Coffee Farmers Association
Noni Putnam, Land Vertebrate Specialist, PQB, HDOA
Mark Wright, Ph.D., UHM Department of Plant & Environmental Protection Sciences

¹ The identification of the public members is based on their sign-in name but are not verified.

Others Virtually Present (cont'd):

Peter Follett, Ph.D., USDA Agricultural Research Service (ARS)
Jonathan Kam, Acting Plant Specialist, PQB, HDOA
Tara Yamashita, Acting Secretary, PQB, HDOA
Sherylyne Namahoe, Secretary, Plant Industry Division, HDOA

II. INTRODUCTION AND COMMENTS

Chairperson Helmuth Rogg introduced himself and asked the Committee members to briefly introduce themselves. Mr. Robert Hauff, Dr. Maria Haws, Dr. Samuel Ohu Gon III, Mr. Thomas Eisen, Ms. Gracelda Simmons, and Mr. Ryan Pe'a introduced themselves. DAG Jodi Yi also introduced herself.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MAY 20, 2022, MEETING

Chairperson Rogg asked Committee members if they had any comments. Committee Member Gon said he was not present at the May 2022 meeting and would like to recuse himself from voting.

Chairperson Rogg asked again if there are any comments to the minutes. There were no comments.

Committee Member Hauff made a motion to approve the minutes. Committee Member Eisen seconded the motion. Chairperson Rogg called for the vote.

Vote: APPROVED 6/0 (Rogg, Hauff, Eisen, Haws, Simmons, and Pe'a), 1
Abstention (Gon)

Motion carries.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JUNE 9, 2022, MEETING

Chairperson Rogg asked Committee members if there are any comments. There were no comments.

Committee Member Gon made a motion to approve the minutes. Committee member Simmons seconded the motion. Chairperson Rogg called for the vote.

Vote: APPROVED 7/0. (Rogg, Hauff, Gon, Eisen, Haws, Simmons, and Pe'a)

Motion carries.

V. COMMENTS FROM GENERAL PUBLIC ON AGENDA ITEMS (ORAL OR WRITTEN)

Chairperson Rogg asked if there were any comments from the general public wishing to provide testimony. Mr. Jason Azus-Richardson said there were no hands raised from the public for testimony.

Chairperson Rogg asked if there were any comments from the Committee members. Committee member Gon said (referring to the agenda item below) - this is very timely, a lot of folks from the coffee industry are excited about having another tool to deal with this pest.

Chairperson Rogg said two written testimonies were received in support of the petition. One was received after the deadline from Kona Coffee Farmers Association. The one that came in on time was from Hawaii Coffee Association, Chris Manfredi the Executive Director.

VI. REQUESTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Entomology:

- (1) Request to: (1) Allow the Importation and Possession of Lab-Reared Strains of the Parasitoid Wasp, *Phymastichus coffea* (Hymenoptera: Eulophidae), an Insect on the List of Restricted Animals (Part A), by Permit, for Field Release to Control the Coffee Berry Borer, *Hypothenemus hampei*, by the USDA ARS and UHM;
- (2) Establish Permit Conditions for the Importation and Field Release of Lab-Reared Strains of the Parasitoid Wasp, *Phymastichus coffea* (Hymenoptera: Eulophidae), an Insect on the List of Restricted Animals (Part A), to Control the Coffee Berry Borer, *Hypothenemus hampei*, by the USDA ARS and UHM; and
- (3) Determine the Probable Impact to the Environment if Lab-Reared Strains of the Parasitoid Wasp, *Phymastichus coffea* (Hymenoptera: Eulophidae), an Insect on the List of Restricted Animals (Part A) Are Accidentally Released.

PQB Entomologist Christopher Kishimoto provided a synopsis of the request.

Mr. Kishimoto mentioned that for the analysis and application of an environmental assessment (EA), the EA requirement is triggered under certain circumstances including when an applicant proposes an action on State or County lands that requires agency approval or is using State or County funding and is not specifically exempted under Chapter 343, Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS). This appears to be the case here. The applicant's request in this instance involves import and possession of *Phymastichus coffea* for field release as biocontrol of coffee berry borer into the

environment. He said one applicant did not want to go through the EA process citing that they will not be using State or County lands, funding employees, or supplies and equipment, while the other has elected to go through the environmental review process. He noted the decision not to go through the environmental review process would represent some challenges for this particular request.

Committee member Hauff said he was surprised that *P. coffea* was on the List of Restricted Animals (Part A) and was curious how it was listed there. Mr. Kishimoto said it was something that was previously looked at and put on the list a long time ago and he believed there had been strong consideration of importing this particular species in the past.

Committee member Hauff asked if that was just HDOA being proactive and anticipating the need for this import and going through the listing process in advance. Mr. Kishimoto believed that was the case. Mr. Hauff stated that was great work and should be done more often.

Committee member Hauff mentioned the applicants talked about needing to do additional mass rearing of *P. coffea* outside of Hawaii and importing them for augmentative release. Would this be covered by the permit? Mr. Kishimoto answered that when the applicants were talking about mass import of *P. coffea*, they planned to do this in the future; this permit would just cover initial imports and releases.

Committee member Hauff asked if there was a need to define a quantity of what's going to be imported so that it is clear that the Committee is not approving mass imports at this time.

Mr. Kishimoto said he thought that was something that the Committee could decide. They could ask the applicants how much *P. coffea* they intend to import, but he felt that the applicants' safeguarding practices and disinfection practices were satisfactory and the PQB is okay with them importing as much as they wanted, provided they apply those practices to everything that they import.

Committee member Hauff mentioned the application included an institution in Puerto Rico as a source for *P. coffea*, but the application only referenced Cenicafé in Colombia. He wanted to know if the insects were going to come from both facilities, and if so, why the applicants were using two facilities versus one. Mr. Kishimoto said he did not know and suggested asking the applicants, though it was his understanding they were only going to import *P. coffea* from Columbia. Mr. Hauff said he was just curious why the Puerto Rico Lab was listed. Chairperson Rogg said shipper one is Cenicafé and shipper two is the University of Puerto Rico and wanted verification from the petitioners if imported *P. coffea* will be going into the quarantine facility according to permit condition #7 for a minimum of two generations. Chairperson Rogg said there was a previous discussion with the idea of importing *P. coffea* straight from Cenicafé

and directly releasing into the field, but that would not be the case here. Mr. Kishimoto confirmed this was correct.

Mr. Darcy Oishi, Acting Manager, PPC, told the Committee that *P. coffea*. Was put onto the List of Restricted Animals, Part A, over 20 years ago as a potential biocontrol agent of tropical nut borer which attacks macadamia. The petition for list placement was submitted by the University of Hawaii, but permit conditions were never established for its import.

Committee member Gon asked Mr. Kishimoto why one member of the Subcommittee on Entomology did not approve the request. Mr. Kishimoto said the reviewer had some issues with how the applicants were doing things, such as how many replications they might have done during testing, concern about cost-to-benefit analysis, and potential concerns about the biology of *P. coffea* and how effective of a biocontrol agent it would be. Dr. Gon replied that considering the history of the use of *P. coffea* elsewhere, it suggests that it has potential for control purposes.

Committee member Gon was also curious about whether or not anyone had considered Hawaii's endemic Scolytid beetles and if they could be attacked by *P. coffea*? Mr. Kishimoto said the researchers also selected multiple native beetle species and this biocontrol agent is not supposed to be able attack any of those. Dr. Gon asked if native close relatives of coffee berry borer were included in the *P. coffea* host range testing, noting *P. coffea*'s host range is genus-specific within the family Cuculionidae. Mr. Kishimoto said the applicants tested some native beetle species to see if they could be attacked by *P. coffea* and noted there are no *Hypothenemus* species native to Hawaii. He said there are some native *Xyleborus* species which may be more closely related to *H. hampei* but the research has found that it did not attack any of those species. Dr. Gon said it is great to hear on the record.

Committee member Tom Eisen said something Mr. Kishimoto mentioned about the EA process caught his attention, noting one of the applicants said they wanted to go through the EA process, and another did not want to. He said because this is a single permit application being brought before the Committee, a decision must be made jointly by the applicants to either go through the EA process, or not.

Mr. Kishimoto agreed that the applicants should jointly decide whether or not they would go through the State's EA process. Not doing so meant they would not be using any State or County lands, funds, employees, equipment, facilities etc. Committee member Hauff asked if that was a decision that should be made by the applicants. Mr. Kishimoto confirmed that the decision should be made by the applicants.

Committee member Eisen said if the entity applying for a permit is a State or County agency, then it's considered an agency action and that agency makes the determinations. If it is non-State or County agencies that are seeking the approval and

proposing the project, then a State or County agency has to be considered the approving agency, and that would likely be the Hawaii Department of Agriculture (HDOA). But who is actually proposing the project determines what agency makes these judgment calls.

Chairperson Rogg said he felt this was a good time to talk about this because HDOA had the same question. Chairperson Rogg reminded the Committee that the EA issue was discussed in a recent petition that was brought before the Board of Agriculture (Board) noting the EA was an important topic of discussion. He thought this was a legitimate question for the Committee as well. Chairperson Rogg asked the Committee how they would address item #3 of the submittal, "Determine the Probable Impact to the Environment if Lab-Reared Strains of the Parasitoid Wasp are Accidentally Released". He noted determining the necessity of the environmental review might need to be mentioned in the Committee's recommendation to the Board.

Committee member Eisen said without an EA being completed and without that analysis of the organism being done, it is very difficult to make the decision on whether or not the release of *P. coffea* into the environment will have a significant impact or not. He said this is why there is an EA review process that produces a vetted document to be used by the decision makers, but until it's completed, no one can make a knowledgeable decision whether *P. coffea*'s release will have a significant impact or not.

Committee member Gon agreed with Committee member Eisen saying unless the Committee did a global literature review of the biology of the species and previous releases, or of its utility and performance elsewhere, including any potential impacts that were done, it would not make much sense to make a recommendation on the potential impact, should it be released, since Hawaii can be a unique situation. He asked if there were similar issues in the past or other potential permits and releases.

Committee member Hauff stated in the past, when a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) has not yet been issued, the Committee has gone ahead and made a recommendation to the Board, but HDOA's Attorney General requires the FONSI be issued before the Board makes a final decision. Committee member Hauff said he was not sure whether the EA is going to be prepared but there was a draft EA attached to the application that had not been published. He asked Mr. Kishimoto to confirm this.

Mr. Kishimoto confirmed that was correct. He said it was something the applicants were drafting and had sent to USDA as part of their requirements for the research. It just was not published in the Environmental Review to satisfy the State's Chapter 343, HRS requirements. Mr. Kishimoto reiterated if the applicants truly are not going to use any State or County lands, funds, etc., then there will not be a need for the EA process. However, he noted that because the University of Hawaii (UH) is indicated as being a collaborator, HDOA has some concerns.

Committee member Eisen stated that after reviewing the attached draft EA, it looked very detailed and a lot of effort went into it. He thought it was prepared with the federal National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process in mind, but noted there were some omissions in the EA that would be necessary to be compliant with Chapter 343, HRS. He highlighted one specific omission was an analysis of significance. He said there are very significant criteria that are enumerated in the rules and the core part of the EA is the analysis of the thirteen (13) significance criteria. He said that is something unique to Hawaii's EA process and is not part of the NEPA process. He said it looked like a NEPA practitioner prepared the draft EA, but it did not address one key issue, which is to determine the notion of significance of the impact to the environment. Committee member Eisen thought it is reasonable or legitimate to have a FONSI but without an analysis of the significance criteria, all the information is not being focused on answering the important question, which is the determination of a FONSI, or maybe having to do an environmental impact statement (EIS).

Committee member Gon said the wording of item #3 of the submittal to determine the probable impact on the environment is probably something the Committee could not really do at this stage. He asked Committee member Eisen if he saw any problems with the applicant's draft EA? Committee member Eisen replied he did not have the opportunity to review the applicants' draft EA in great detail, but it appeared the level of analysis was substantial. He said if the applicants ultimately answered their own version of the environmental impact question on the federal level that *P. coffea* will not be problematic, then one might presume that a similar result would happen with the State. He said until the draft EA actually went through the process it would be premature to speculate on the results, but there seemed to be a lot of detail provided that could go towards the analysis that a FONSI was appropriate.

Mr. Kishimoto suggested letting the applicants speak with the Committee.

Dr. Mark Wright, one of the applicants from UH, introduced himself. He stated that they are prepared to go through the EA process but for the purpose of the actual import of *P. coffea*, it was the understanding of everyone involved that it did not involve state funding, etc. and funding for import would be from USDA Agriculture Research Service (ARS). He said USDA ARS submitted a substantial amount of data showing this importation would not have significant negative environmental impacts, but they were starting to hear people say they did not submit enough data. Dr. Wright told the Committee they looked very carefully at endemic species that are the closest relatives of the target species. He noted their work was not a trivial effort and reiterated he was prepared to submit an EA for the State process. He said the decision not to submit an EA was from USDA, who funded this, and ARS said they wanted to move ahead with the application to get it done, and the EA could be done later, once UH became involved in the project. Dr. Wright understood it looked contradictory to be listed as an applicant and he brought it up before and no one seemed to have an issue about it at

that time. He asked the Committee if they had any specific questions about the request and he would be happy to address them.

Chairperson Rogg explained that the Committee cannot make a requirement whether or not an EA is needed as they are just an advisory committee making recommendations to the Board, who ultimately makes the decision. Chairperson Rogg said from his experience, some of the requests that have gone before the Board have caused issues for approval because of an incomplete EA. He said there have been delays in voting or deferrals in decision-making by the Board because the EA was not finalized. Chairperson Rogg reiterated he wanted to make sure that this request has the best chance of success if the Committee made the recommendation of approval, saying the EA question would definitely come up.

Dr. Wright thought the determination to go through the environmental review process was very opaque. He felt it was hard to figure out how to make that determination but said that they were prepared to do an EA, noting he had almost completed his draft EA. Dr. Wright then asked the Committee about an issue he had about what if there was an accidental release of this parasitoid. Was there a big concern because their intent is to make a purposeful release of this parasitoid. That kind of mutes the whole accidental release part. He asked the Committee if their objection was if there was an accidental release prior to them rearing *P. coffea* for two generations before they released it.

Chairperson Rogg replied that was correct. He explained the EA process is a procedural one. There were issues with previous requests that did not have an EA, using an earlier request for mosquito import as an example. He said there are going to be questions, reviews, and people looking into details. He said the Committee's concern is if there is one piece of the procedure missing that could derail the whole request.

Committee member Eisen said he brought this up as part of the process, not to suggest the request not move through the process, because the applicants did a lot of work. He said it appeared the process was not yet completed, to the extent that Dr. Wright is proposing the project, or UH is proposing the project, it was difficult to say that State funds will not be involved. The presumption is if the University of Hawaii, as a State agency, is proposing something, then that triggers the EA process.

Dr. Wright said the way he and his fellow applicant interpreted the EA process was the permit would be to introduce *P. coffea* into quarantine and release it, which USDA ARS would do. The permit, to their understanding, had no bearing on the process of preparing the EA documents prior to that since no State or County lands or funding would be used by USDA ARS. The permit would also have no bearing on what happens after *P. coffea* has become established in the State since once *P. coffea* became established, UH would then be free to collect it from the field for releases elsewhere. That was their understanding.

Committee member Eisen responded that one of the core triggers of requiring the EA process is the use of State funds. Dr. Wright said he felt there was a difference between applying for a permit versus actually conducting the work because someone could apply for a permit but not necessarily conduct the research. Committee member Eisen said the answer to that question is who makes the determination that the environmental review process should be completed. If the applicant is not a State or County agency, then somebody else makes the decision. But if the applicant is a State or County agency then that agency makes the decisions related to whether an EA review is necessary. It may not be UH's decision to make and the earlier these issues are resolved the better.

Chairperson Rogg asked if the other Committee members had any questions for Dr. Wright.

A member of the public, Suzanne Shriner, President of Kona Coffee Farmers Association, addressed the Committee and said at the time this draft EA was put together, she assisted the other applicant, Dr. Peter Follett, in the typesetting of the application for the formal EA process. Her comment aside from her support letter was that Dr. Follett had documented that he tried to upload the document of the draft EA on September 20, 2021, to Office of Environmental Quality Control using their online form. She believed the EA was rejected because it came from USDA's Agricultural Research Service and it needed to have the stamp of Department of Agriculture or another State agency to move forward. This was really where this process got held up and why the draft EA was never formalized into an EA because they needed HDOA's support to move forward. Ms. Shriner said Dr. Follett would be better able to confirm that, but this was her understanding and at that time, the intent was to go through the full EA process.

Chairperson Rogg asked Mr. Kishimoto about a previous discussion where it was agreed that HDOA was not the agency to submit the draft EA. Mr. Kishimoto said to the best of his knowledge, UH as a collaborator and State agency, might be the agency that would submit the draft EA for Peter Follett. Committee member Eisen recalled a response was generated to Dr. Follett saying his draft EA has to come from a State or County agency either as a proposing agency or approving agency and it certainly seems like if UH becomes the proposing agency, and they make the determination of whether or not this request needs to go through the environmental review process, then the issue can be resolved. He said if UH becomes the proposing agency, they can determine if Chap. 343, HRS, applies and if UH did not want to be the proposing agency for the draft EA, then another State or County agency would need to do that on behalf of Dr. Follett and USDA.

Dr. Wright stated he thought it was very unclear how this process works. He said the draft EA was prepared, but didn't know about these 13 points a State EA must address,

but he was fully prepared to address those points. Committee member Eisen said he could provide guidance in his role with the Environmental Review Program and could provide information outside the meeting on how to proceed.

Chairperson Rogg asked if there were any other comments or questions. Committee member Hauff asked if there was any way of moving this request to the Board so it can be voted on once either the EA FONSI was issued, or a determination was made that no State funds were used.

Chairperson Rogg said the Committee can recommend that the Board approve this request contingent upon the completion of the EA process. He remembered when a similar situation happened with a mosquito import request, the Board approved it once the EA had been completed and approved. The Committee is not making the approval, just making a recommendation to the Board. The Committee can say we recommend it because the applicants said they will prepare and submit the EA for approval.

Committee member Gon liked that course of action because it would certainly be possible to make a recommendation that Items #1 and #2 move forward as is, with Item #3 pending the submittal of an EA from UH, with the Committee's initial assessment that the probable impact of accidental release would be low based on the data provided. Chairperson Rogg asked if there were any objections to that. Committee member Gon said if there were no objections, he would be happy to so move.

Chairperson Rogg asked the Committee if there were any questions about the proposed permit conditions. Committee member Hauff asked Dr. Wright if he had looked at all permit conditions and if they appeared workable from his point of view. Dr. Wright confirmed he reviewed all proposed permit conditions. He had a concern about permit condition #5 because it appeared UH cannot participate in any work with *P. coffea*. He said their interpretation was once the organism is established in the environment, UH would be free to work on it. He felt this issue should be revisited. However, once the EA process is completed, permit condition #5 can be changed or removed, as discussed with Mr. Kishimoto and others. Dr. Wright felt all other conditions were fine. He noted they responded to various questions about the permit conditions in response to questions Mr. Kishimoto sent earlier and believed they were able to accommodate them all.

Mr. Kishimoto agreed with Dr. Wright. He said permit condition #5 was based on not having a FONSI or an exemption in place. Should the applicants go through the EA process and obtain a State FONSI or an exemption, then permit condition #5 can be eliminated because the applicants will be free to use State resources, funding, and land. He said the same was true with permit condition #4. If they had the FONSI or exemption, that permit condition allows the applicants to take *P. coffea* out of quarantine and store it at one of their facilities or labs making it easier to release, especially given its very short adult life span.

Dr. Wright replied they understood, but UH had no intention of actually doing any of the biocontrol releases. Fellow applicant Dr. Follet and USDA would handle the quarantine and release. Mr. Kishimoto asked Dr. Wright for confirmation that UH would be applying to go through the EA review process with the State. Dr. Wright said yes, in order to make this process streamlined and make everybody happy. It seemed like the obvious thing to do. He told the Committee he was perfectly prepared to do so. He reiterated that he had been preparing to submit one, but tried a while ago and it didn't seem necessary at that time. He said it seemed logical that they should do it, noting there should be an impact assessment. The one they submitted to USDA is very comprehensive and would be the core of what they would submit for the State EA. Committee member Gon thanked Dr. Wright for stating he was willing to go through the environmental review process.

Chairperson Rogg asked Dr. Wright to confirm that he understood that the port of Honolulu would be where *P. coffea* initially enters the State and would be inspected there before being allowed to be transported to USDA's quarantine facility in Volcano located on Hawaii Island. Dr. Wright agreed, cautioning that it was his colleague's (Dr. Follet) part of the project, but his understanding was that it is acceptable and workable. Chairperson Rogg reminded Dr. Wright about the use of State resources triggering the need for environmental review. Dr. Wright responded that Dr. Follett would be picking up any shipments of *P. coffea*.

Chairperson Rogg asked Dr. Wright if he had any questions for Committee. Dr. Wright was curious what people thought about the draft EA. But if there were no real concerns about that, then he was fine. Committee member Hauff felt the information provided by the applicants was really helpful. He said they did a good job backing it up with the studies and the breadth of the non-target testing was great, including six native Scolitids. He also wanted to know how *P. coffea* was going to be used in the field by farmers and how it was used in the places where it has already been released. Would it require regular augmentative releases like seasonal releases, or will it become really established so farmers can rely on either wild reservoirs of *P. coffea* for good control in coffee plantations.

Dr. Wright explained the initial thought was to propose this as an augmentative agent that the ARS would rear in portable quarantine facilities or mass production facilities. They shifted away from that and now expect *P. coffea* will become established. He noted there is feral and unmanaged coffee all over that provides reservoirs of coffee berry borer (CBB) that could facilitate establishment of *P. coffea*. Since it persists with very low densities of CBB in Kenya, where *P. coffea* is originally from, and it appears to suppress CBB efficiently. The point being that *P. coffea* persists with low densities of CBB and we have high densities in Hawaii. Dr. Wright said his expectation is that *P. coffea* will become established and become a typical classical biocontrol agent and you won't have to actually do anything to use it except restrict pesticides applications to

conserve the insects into the environment once its established. He noted augmentative biocontrol releases come with a lot of issues like production costs and timing of releases.

Chairperson Rogg asked if there were any other questions. Committee member Gon said if not then his motion stands. Chairperson Rogg asked if Committee member Gon would repeat his motion for the record. Committee member Gon said, "With regard to item number 4 on the agenda reviewed by the Committee, I move to #1, advise to allow the importation and possession of our lab reared strains of *Phymastichus coffea*; #2 establish permit conditions for the importation and field release of *P. coffea*; and #3 given the information that was obtained during this meeting, our assessment is the probable impact of the lab reared strains, if accidentally released, will be very low." Chairperson Rogg asked if anyone wanted to second the motion. Committee member Hauff seconded.

Chairperson Rogg asked for further discussion, comments, or questions from the public. Hearing none, he asked if there was any further discussion, comments, or questions from the Committee. Committee member Hauff wanted to comment on the public testimony from Chris Manfredi. He said he was not really sure what his suggestion about releasing the parasitoid on another island was all about. He recommended to Dr. Wright to make sure that he includes a wide breadth of consultation with coffee growers on Hawaii island as he moves through the Chapter 343, HRS process. Committee member Hauff said he understood that there is probably a really diverse group of coffee farmers there but the public testimony from Mr. Manfredi signaled to him that there might be coffee growers in Kona who are uncomfortable with this project for some reason, and he thought it would be important to make sure that they have the right information from the EA when it gets published as a draft. Chairperson Rogg thanked Committee member Hauff for his comments and read the passage of Mr. Manfredi's letter: "We suggest that the initial release be made on a neighbor island with consent of growers there, instead of in Kona, so further study may be advanced in a more controlled and isolated setting."

Committee member Gon pointed out the Committee discussed the preparation of the EA and that the assessment of item #3 of this request was upon review of the attached draft EA, with confidence the final EA would cover those points discussed and would support the applicants' assertion that the release of *P. coffea* would likely have a low impact on the environment.

Chairperson Rogg asked if there was any further discussion. Hearing none, he called for the vote.

Vote: Approved 7/0. (Rogg, Hauff, Gon, Eisen, Haws, Simmons, and Pe'a)

Motion carries.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Having no further business, Chairperson Rogg called for a motion to adjourn. Committee member Gon made a motion to adjourn. Committee member Simmons seconded the motion. Chairperson Rogg called for a vote.

Vote: Approved 7/0. (Rogg, Hauff, Gon, Eisen, Haws, Simmons, and Pe'a)

Motion carries. Meeting was adjourned at 2:46 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan Ho
PQB Inspection and Compliance Section Chief