



Pacific Islands RPB Meeting

May 29-30, 2014

9am-4:30pm GST

RPB Members in Attendance:

American Samoa:

CNMI: Frank Rabauliman, Fran Castro

Guam: Joseph Cameron, Dr. Jason Biggs

Hawaii:

WPFMC:

NOAA: Mike Tosatto

JCS: CAPT Pete Smith (USN)

DOD: Nicole Griffin (USMC)

EPA:

DOT:

DOI:

USCG:

USDA:

RPB Alternates:

American Samoa: Chris King, Selaina Tuimavave

Hawaii: Leo Asuncion

DOI: Loyal Mehrhoff

WPFMC: Mariquita Taitigue

Others and Public:

Executive Secretary: Sarah Pautzke

Facilitator: Miki Lee

Public: Rick McGuire (USN), Carl Dela Cruz (WPFMC), Jack Ogunoro (WPFMC), Cheryl Anderson (PROP)

AGENDA OVERVIEW

- Introduction of co-lead and RPB members or alternates
- Signing of charter
- RPB update
- Refinement of Stakeholder Engagement Plan
- Discussion about marine spatial planning-related projects in the region
- Discussion of issues CMSP can help
- Development of actions and tasks for objectives
- Discussion of next RPB meeting timing

The meeting opened with a welcome by the federal co-lead, Mr. Tosatto. Udall Institute was acknowledged for their meeting support, as was the Western Pacific Fishery Management Council (WPFMC). Everyone in the room then introduced themselves and the agency for which they work.

CHARTER SIGNATURES

RPB members who were present signed the charter, which was finalized during the April 22, 2014, teleconference. The remaining signatures needed are for both American Samoa members, the WPFMC member, EPA, and DOT. Hawaii members, NOAA, USDA, and DOI signed prior to the meeting. It is expected that the fully executed document will be distributed within 30 days.

RPB UPDATE

Ms. Pautzke, the Executive Secretary, provided an overview of the status of the RPB. This included a brief background on the National Ocean Policy, the creation of the Pacific Islands RPB, defining marine planning and why it is important, and the benefits of marine planning. Members were briefed about the status of the New England, Mid Atlantic, and West Coast RPBs.

The Marine Planning Handbook developed by the National Ocean Council (NOC) states that RPBs should:

- Assess regional capacity for marine planning
- Host introductory discussions with members, stakeholders, and the public
- Agree on a shared vision
- Identify regional goals and objectives
- Develop a work plan that outlines how the region will develop a marine plan
- Analyze data, uses, services, and impacts
- Develop and evaluate options for achieving the goal(s) and objectives
- Provide a draft plan for public comment
- Provide a final plan for NOC review and concurrence
- Implement, monitor, evaluate, and modify the plan over time

The Work Plan should describe the overall planning process, key milestones and products, available and required resources, and how the RPB will substantively engage participants.

To date, the PI RPB has hosted introductory discussions with members and identified regional goals and objectives. Through other venues, such as WPFMC meetings, the PI RPB has engaged stakeholders and members of the public. Members have discussed their vision, although not agreed on language to date; however, there is vision language in the Framework and Implementation Plan for Ocean Planning (FWIP) the members may agree on. The PI RPB has drafted and approved a charter, drafted a stakeholder engagement plan, drafted the FWIP, and created a website to communicate about its work.

Development of a data portal/hub is still in progress; the Pacific Islands Region is lagging behind other regions in this efforts. The Federal Co-lead is looking for a project lead within NOAA and will keep the RPB apprised of his efforts.

End Zone Discussion

RPB members discussed the end zone, or end product, for the RPB. One product (though not the end product) is a data portal, which some take to be a portal to data, while others view as a mapping product. A mapping product similar to PacIOOS' and MARCO's could provide the display of data within the portal. Alternatively, people can download data within the portal to their own mapping interfaces. The RPB could create something similar to the University of Hawaii's "Atlas of Hawaii," which includes layers of geology, various uses, climatology, culture, and more. The portal could indicate where compatible and incompatible uses are by area/region. The portal could include maps showing various uses and other data.

The “plan” could be more of a document describing a process that helps address public, federal, state, and territorial interests. It could be a set of recommendations about how to do activities (not a formulation of policies or regulatory authority) that indicate reasonable and balanced use. Other end products included slightly expanding the Framework and Work Plan and making that the plan, or developing a bigger CMS plan that looks more like the Rhode Island Special Area Management Plan (RI SAMP). It’s unclear if a fully developed document like the RI SAMP is necessary though.

Mr. Tosatto provided a diagram of his visualization of an end product. The visualization is of a person who, with clear sight because the issues are known, has all the information in hand from us to climb a ladder of steps including data acquisition, understanding issues and impacts, acquiring resources, and drafting a proposal, toward a “slide” through a smooth and quick approval process for their activity. CMSP provides the “eyeglasses” for clear vision and work to make the ladder rungs sturdy and easy to climb.

It was commented that Hawaii may choose to develop a policy as a result of the RPB’s recommendations and that other decision makers may choose to do the same. However, there was also concern voiced that the process possibly will not have teeth or be compelling enough to be adhered to. The Plan could be useful for identifying predictable, reasonable guidance. For example, best practices relating to fish ponds and other protected areas. Alternatively, the Plan may sit on a shelf. The RPB will endeavor to create something that remains current and pertinent in planning activities for the coastal and marine areas.

It is important that the CMS Plan present the specific and unique characteristics within the region. It was also noted that the outcome of the coral Endangered Species Act (ESA) listings may impact the PI RPB’s FWIP.

PROP Update

Ms. Castro provided a PROP update. Endorsement by governors is expected by the end of June 2014. Ms. Castro was elected as the PROP chair; Mr. Cameron is vice chair. They are serving from July 2014-July 2016. The following Action Coordination Teams (ACTs) have been formed: Climate Change, ESA, Coastal Hazards Resilience, and Data Portal.

The PROP is exploring funding opportunities from CREST and PRIMO, and is tracking the \$5 million request currently before Congress. It is exploring other funding opportunities, as well.

The PROP Action Plan priorities include climate and disaster resilience, collaboration with the PI RPB, and strengthening PROP’s institutional capacity. Progress in these areas has been made including examining anticipated impacts of the proposed coral ESA listing, strategizing on development of local incident command teams to assess ecological threats from disaster, the development of ACTs, and a discussion about outreach, including completion of the PROP website.

The following territorial/state updates were provided:

American Samoa is undergoing an administration change, which will result in a PROP membership change. The existing E.O. to establish the Ocean Resources Management Council is being revised to establish a policy. And American Samoa’s Climate Change Adaptation Plan is complete; it is being shared with villages for review and feedback.

The CNMI vulnerability assessment for Saipan is complete and posted at www.climatecnmi.net.

Guam's Homeland Security and Civil Defense Offices have started drafting climate change and resiliency mitigation recommendations for natural disasters. Work on the Climate Change Resiliency Task Force report to the President is 99% complete. Guam has a new Coastal Zone Management (CZM) director; there is an effort to put coral reef conservation under an agency other than CZM.

There was a Coastal Vulnerability Workshop of 400 people in Guam, the focus of which was to understand perceptions relating to coastal storms and hazards. Workshop results will be reported and integrated into marketing and outreach strategies. The Pacific Islands Science Center and Hawaii are working on this endeavor. The Pacific Islands Climate Change Education Partnership is piloting a formal education program on climate change.

Hawaii has submitted a request to the legislature to fund an analyst. An online tool to aid permitting is in development, which incorporates GIS data and describes coastal, land and ocean uses. Another request was made to the legislature to fund a study to assess sea level rise impacts. The tool will be shared with the community via NOAA meetings. The state's Climate Change Action Team has been meeting every two weeks since January 2014 and is working to compile a set of best practices. Lastly, the Invasive Species Council applied for \$5 million.

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PLAN

Members reviewed the stakeholder engagement plan (SEP) and made modifications to sections defining the purpose of stakeholder engagement, definition of stakeholders, and the various opportunities for engagement. A second draft is being generated that will be reviewed by members and potentially adopted.

Members discussed methods for stakeholder engagement. Relying on RPB members who best know the groups and methods that work best for their jurisdiction or agency was the primary suggestion. The other suggestion was to use free media and social media. Department of Defense typically posts activities on the Installation website and makes announcements to the press. Military Community Plan and Liaison Officers also engage stakeholders and go to neighborhood board meetings. In the Marianas, talk shows, posters in stores and community centers, and word of mouth at social gatherings are the most effective ways to let stakeholders know about RPB activities, as well as the Pacific Daily News and Marianas Variety. The State of Hawaii has OEQC for NEPA actions that involve the state. Department of Interior has open house formats as a way to converse with stakeholders. RISA does outreach with small islands and U.S. jurisdictions. Utilizing high school students to get the word out and engage community members was recommended. Venue-hopping was also suggested as a way to take opportunities of others' meetings. For now, if there are discussion topics that should reach specific stakeholder groups, the Executive Secretary will contact RPB members to disseminate the information more broadly (in addition to using social media) but RPB members also agreed to email points of contact to Ms. Pautzke, identifying who the topical people are for topical emails.

Prior to engaging stakeholders, the message being delivered and questions being asked need to be clear. A list of issues should be developed first, including climate change, fisheries, government, aquaculture, renewable energy, and more. Then specific agencies and people to contact for engagement would be identified. At this point, identification of specific stakeholders is a general discussion; greater clarity will occur once the RPB begins specific activities. In the meantime, Pautzke will create a spreadsheet that

includes columns for island areas and is divided by subject, region, and point of contact. For a list of general stakeholder groups generated at the RPB meeting, please see Appendix A.

Task: RPB members will email points of contact to Ms. Pautzke, identifying who the topical people are for topical emails.

Task: RPB members will forward emails as appropriate to their email distribution lists and/or agency outreach coordinators.

Task: Ms. Pautzke will create a spreadsheet that includes columns for island areas and is divided by subject, region, and point of contact.

RPB RESOURCES

The operating budget required for sustaining RPB planning and implementation thus far was presented to the members. In-kind and cash support were explained. RPB members were asked for suggestions for continued funding. Suggestions included seeking funds from federal, state, and territorial partners, as well as potentially initiating member dues. A fiscal sponsor to house the funds was also discussed. While not without precedent, for some partners a fiscal sponsor relationship can be challenging, requiring at least one level of legal review, memoranda of agreement, and high level authorizations.

Task: Ms. Pautzke will draft a list of short-term budget needs to be distributed to members.

Task: RPB members can use the short-term budget needs to request/secure funding from their agencies.

MARIANAS-SPECIFIC ISSUES

Characterization of issues is the first step for creating a process or plan through which they can be addressed. RPB members brainstormed initial lists of military and non military issues in the Marianas, as well as issues that are pertinent to other regions and the Marianas. The RPB also developed a list of biologically and/or physically important items that could be aided by CMSP, like Laoloa Bay and an endangered plant on Rota. These lists can be found in Appendix B.

FRAMEWORK AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

RPB members reviewed the *Framework and Implementation Plan for Ocean Planning*. The Executive Secretary clarified that this document is intended to lay out steps necessary for developing a CMS plan, thus the RPB members renamed the document *PI RPB Framework and Work Plan: A Roadmap Towards Our CMS Plan*. The next steps are to clean up the document based on the edits during the RPB meeting, route to members for review, then seek adoption electronically by RPB members. Mr. Mehrhoff suggested that the Framework and Implementation Plan could be revised to become the actual CMS Plan. Mr. Tosatto said he would seek advice from the NOC about whether that would be feasible because at this point, it is unknown how much specificity or detail is expected in the regional CMS plans. It was cautioned that more detail is likely needed to make this a viable CMS plan. The following is a summary of what was discussed for each of the draft plan's four objectives.

Objective 1: Best Available and Publicly Accessible Information. The creation of a Data Committee was again recommended. This committee would explore the design and function of a data portal, including

identifying specific types of data most useful (versus “grabbing” all that is available), sources of existing data, identification of required sharing agreements, hosting options, and costs. RPB members also discussed early engagement of stakeholders to make the case for an accessible data portal, identify the types of information they need, and identify the types that they have. A major outcome or product of this objective is a data portal as a teaching and learning tool.

The time to be proactive is now, asking pointed questions and making specific requests. Stakeholders need to be asked what their uses and conflicts are, as well as what information they want and need, and venue-hopping should be done to engage stakeholders early. Stakeholders can also help identify the end zone – the RPB could consider testing the RPB’s end zone for reaction by the stakeholders.

At this point, a closed digital platform for the purposes of the RPB members-only was asked about, similar to the one run by the Coral Reef Task Force. Ms. Pautzke will follow up with Ms. Carey Morishige, the Executive Secretary of the All Islands Committee.

Objective 2: Stakeholder Involvement, Priorities, and Rights. Before reaching out, the RPB needs to be clear about the purpose of both its end zone and engagement efforts. The need for a list of who best to engage across the region was also discussed, along with ways to make engagement efficient and effective (by “venue hopping” and relying of RPB members, as examples).

One suggestion for this objective was to reorder the list of actions: identifying data needs, RPB members add to data, ask data resources about availability of data, then groundtruth. For Action 2-1, one task is to maintain a calendar of meetings and activities; an RPB member recommended making this task region-wide because it seemed Hawaii-centric. For example, rotary clubs and the Saipan community center could be avenues of stakeholder engagement.

Objective 3: Integrated Intergovernmental Decision-Making. One of the primary products of this objective could be a flow diagram showing the permitting process. This serves two purposes: to make clear what the process is; and to identify barriers within the process that need improvement. Developing relationships among permitting authorities and regulatory agencies was cited as an important part of the RPB’s work. The RPB should identify actions and discern which are RPB-centric versus the responsibility of other stakeholders. For example, a port specific project would include the involvement of trust agencies, port authorities, EPA, and ACE. However, it is unclear if there is a shared responsibility with the RPB. The responsibility of the RPB would fall perhaps in detailing where permitting hoops are to allow ease of navigation of these hoops.

An added action suggested was to organize annual meetings with regulatory agencies and permittees (multi-agency, open to the public) to understand the conflicts and issues. This could lead to development of a strategy to address current problems, improve communication between agencies, and build channels between users and relevant authorities. This action could replace Actions 3-1 and 3-2.

Another suggested action was for the RPB to facilitate the relationship between regionally-based agencies and applicants/users. Ultimately, this would take a life of its own and no longer be facilitated by the RPB. This could be the new 3-2.

Knowing what activities are planned or ongoing is useful. Actual versus speculative projects should be teased apart. For 3-1 and 3-2, it is unclear how maintaining project sharing outcomes will be done

easily. These should be edited to amend the timeframes and add agencies (not just RPB member agencies).

Action 3-4 could be collapsed with 3-1 (3-1: develop mechanisms and channels of communication between RPB and member agencies regarding projects, 3-4: develop and maintain a section of the RPB website dedicated to information updates regarding projects). 3-4 could be considered a task under the action of 3-1. It was also asked how the RPB could think larger than individual actions to take on a more programmatic view.

Regarding 3-6, annually identifying issues the RPB could assist with regarding conflicting issues or interagency conflicts, an RPB member cautioned being clear about when an action would fall into an escalation process.

The hope is that this objective will allow agencies to get beyond being reactive to projects, but instead allow them to provide early guidance. Identification of projects by RPB members will inform the development of Objective 3; this would include projects beyond RPB-member-agency projects. The project list should be kept on the RPB website so that the RPB could be used as an information conduit. However, it was cautioned that keeping the list updated will be challenging.

Objective 4: Promote Healthy Ocean and Coastal Ecosystems. A primary product of this objective is data summary and synthesis, data portal, and compiled permitting resource materials to ultimately achieve an informed, coordinated, and collaborative planning efforts across the region. The outcome was reworded to add that planning efforts would perpetuate biodiversity and maintain...ecosystems. It was clarified that "provisioning" meant food and supplies.

Action 4-2 was struck because it was similar to 3-6.

Action 4-3 was changed to 4-2. It was pointed out that development of a data portal falls under objective 1 as well. Added to 4-3 was identification and inclusion of data sources pertaining to the ecosystems, like species, special and protected areas, ecosystem and habitat information, and other natural resource issues.

The new Action 4-3 was added: Synthesize and summarize data to facilitate planning by identifying ocean use patterns, areas of conflicting use, special use areas, compatible uses, and critical ecosystem services. The activity timeframe would be September 2015 - November 2016. The primary products are data summary and synthesis, improved data portal, and compiled permitting resource materials. It was suggested that the Protected Areas Database could be folded in.

Task: Ms. Pautzke to contact All Islands Committee Executive Secretary about possible in-house website.

Task: Ms. Pautzke to update the Framework and Work Plan.

Task: RPB members will review the document. Potential electronic adoption.

SPATIALLY-ORIENTED PROJECTS

Spatially-oriented projects can feed the data portal and aid coastal and marine planning by reducing duplication and enhancing cross-agency coordination. Some projects might change a data layer, some

provide information that will aid a project, while other data simply provides good information. Each RPB member provided a list of projects they knew of in their area. The list will be expanded on in the future and the intent is for the RPB Executive Secretary to maintain the list, which can be found in Appendix C.

CLOSING BUSINESS

Ms. Pautzke announced membership changes. She will contact the new members from DOD, Coast Guard and NRCS to encourage their participation. Ms. Pautzke noted that the original Charter stands; there is no need for new signatures due to membership changes.

The RPB agreed to meet every six months to promote progression on the development of its CMS Plan, going back to an annual meeting schedule as appropriate. Ms. Pautzke will identify a possible fall 2014 meeting date.

Possible “venue hopping” opportunities: Convene all Hawaii members in a single space during conference calls; dovetail RPB meetings with PROP meetings; meet prior to the Coral Reef Conference; and get on the Coral Reef Conference agenda to provide an update to stakeholders.

NEXT RPB MEETING

The next RPB meeting is tentatively planned for November 2014. Ms. Pautzke will poll members for their availability.

APPENDIX A: STAKEHOLDER GROUPS

The following is a list of stakeholder groups identified by the RPB members at the May 2014 RPB meeting. It is not all-inclusive and will be added to over time.

Aquaculture

Renewable energy

Fisheries

Recreational

- Fishing, diving, paddle boat, motor boat, parasail

Government

Tourism

Shipping – Maritime Transportation

- Husbandry agents, shipping lines, ferries

Communications and Energy

- Fiber optic cables, electric cables

Material extraction

- Mining

Watershed groups

Ports and harbors

Climate change

NGOs – TNC, Ocean Conservancy, local NGOs

Cultural practitioners

Military

Mayors (CNMI, Guam), City and County for Hawaii, Villages for AS

Municipal councils

Civic groups

APPENDIX B: MILITARY AND NON-MILITARY ISSUES IN THE MARIANAS, AS WELL AS IMPORTANT ITEMS THAT COULD BE POSITIVELY IMPACTED BY CMSP

The following is the start of a list of non-military issues that will be added to by RPB members:

- CNMI submerged lands, including how various laws apply to territorial sea areas. This issue will provide an opportunity for the entire region to learn best practices, how to engage users, and which laws and rules are most useful.
- It is important to know where and how marine sports operators in CNMI (parasail, jet ski, kayak, paddle boards) are operating, their impacts, and conflicts with other uses.
- CNMI Data are available, but effort is needed to bring the layers together to create a picture.
- In both Guam and CNMI, coastal development, including land clearing and run-off, are issues.
- Access to MPAs for cultural practices on Guam is an issue.
- The Micronesia Challenge looks to how to integrate marine and terrestrial conservation areas.
- General lack of awareness of the importance of protection and preservation of cultural and ecological resources.
- Potential marine side to the Micronesian biosecurity effort.
- Streamlining of port projects permitting processes.
- Improved access to ports.
- Dumping related to non-military activities and of derelict vessels.
- Sea water air conditioning projects.

The following is the start of a list of military issues that will be added to by RPB members:

- Military issues include access to information regarding military uses, which can be challenging.
- Guam military build-up.
- Military exercises.
- MITT
- Environmental impact statements drafted by the military.
- CJMT, where guns are in the water as people travel to Saipan.
- Farallon de Medinilla military exercises conflicting with migratory birds.
- Dredging dump sites.
- In-water traffic, including the prepositioning ships outside Saipan.
- Siting for firing ranges.
- Diversion program at the Saipan airport.

Special areas for resources that CMSP could potentially help:

- Laolao Bay
- West Rota volcano
- Apra Harbor
- Fishing banks
- Monuments (volcanic units and the Marianas Trench) and National Parks (Invasion beaches)
- MPAs in CNMI and Guam
- Compromised beaches and coastal areas that have been closed for health issues
- Bird Island
- Sarigan, Aguigan, Asuncion, Maug, and Uracas

- A cost benefit analysis for ship wrecks could be a potential CMSP outcome because grounded vessels may be leaching oil and iron, but they cost money to recover, and some are a source of tourism/diving revenue. These include aircrafts, tanks, and vessels.
- Turtle nesting beaches and other protected species sites and areas.
- Turtle and shark area in Samoa.
- Endangered plant on Rota - *Nesogenes rotensis*.

APPENDIX C: SPATIALLY-ORIENTED PROJECTS

The following is considered a “starter list” – one that will be added to along the way by RPB members:

American Samoa

- Fagaloa human-use project.
- Village-based MPA mapping project.
- Project Notification Review System -GIS mapping.
- Benthic habitat mapping (including fish abundance and species diversity).
- Wind turbine energy project.
- Vegetation mapping.
- Sea turtle monitoring.
- Master plans for all ports and airports, focusing on improving infrastructure. All plans available in electronic form.
- Airport and small harbors expansion on outer islands to come.
- Fiber optic cable is being dropped to connect seven islands. The impact of cable landing in ports or near sea walls being assessed.

NOAA

- West Kona and Manell-Geus (Merizo) watersheds as habitat (multi-agency) foci under the Habitat Blueprint; identifying what is going on, where the gaps are and how to enhance/improve water quality.
- Progress being made with the Marianas Monument Plan, which will have a spatial component. The draft of plan and EA are expected to be out by end of current calendar year.
- Impact analysis being conducted in large vessel closed area in American Samoa; considering a short-term no vessel area to address albacore downturn.
- The Council is considering reducing or removing large vessel restrictions in CNMI. A decision will be made within a year.
- The Hawaii Island renewal energy programmatic EIS has been completed and contains a lot of data on shipping

Hawaii

- DBEDT, Office of Renewable Energy conducting geo-spatial planning.
- Department of Health (Hazards, Clean Air and Clean Water Branches) has completed some geo-spatial planning.

Guam

- University of Guam Sea Grant is leading a community-driven watershed rehab project (not in a prioritized/MPA zone, but considered a significant fishing area).
- University of Guam Marine Lab is undertaking 3-4 projects for DOD.
- Marine Lab nesting beach turtle study, with near shore, in shore habitat assessment.
- Habitat baseline assessment of all DOD waters for the Territory of Guam, including Apra Harbor and the Northern Coast. This is a GIS based, spatially oriented endeavor that will have water quality systems in place as well as permanent transects for habitat monitoring, including gathering water quality data.
- Several terrestrial studies, including fresh water streams, engendered trees and bat.
- Active in Climate Change Resiliency Task Force.

- Concern about storm impacts. The 2014 El Nino prediction of particular concern.
- Involved in sea level rise initiatives.
- Guam and other small island state issues include food security and environmental refugees (people moving away from their home island and losing culture and language). Report to the President expected by September 2014.

DOD

- Warning areas are on FAA navigation maps.
- Attempting to represent spatially, integrated natural and cultural resources plans by installation. (Unsure if information will be accessible to others; may be considered a sensitive, internal document. Also may not be integratable with other data.)
- Master plans, though not publicly available.
- MITT study counting the number of cetaceans in the area. Information possibly not publicly available.
- EPA clean-up sites/efforts.
- Griffin noted that some information may be relevant and useful to CMSP, but availability will need to be assessed and requested on a case by case basis in order to address national security concerns.

Military

- Completed EISs for proposed training and testing areas.
- Navy coral protection program.
- DOD is leading a number of research and development efforts. These should be reviewed and consolidated.

Department of the Interior

- Taking all discretionary funds projects to get them spatially on a map (terrestrial coastal, fresh water and marine).
- Regulatory projects (wind and solar throughout the Pacific, Guam, CNMI, American Samoa, Hawaii (wave energy, off-shore and coastal wind farms, underwater cable, ocean water AC)
- FWL coordination act, looking at harbor expansions, throughout pacific.
- USFW water studies.
- NPS asked to conduct a study on a national park unit (coastal, likely not marine) in Rota.
- Plant and bird surveys on Northern CNMI islands and Guam with Navy.
- USGS Ridge to Reef research project, looks at sedimentation for land use and impacts to coral reefs.
- On-going critical habitat designations on all main Hawaiian islands.
- Critical habitat listings for Guam, CNMI and American Samoa.
- Petitions to list liwi.
- Pacific island energy initiative to help streamline.
- Internal landscape mapping.
- USGS's data effort to document Pacific biodiversity has shut down.
- Oil spill response infrastructure for Guam, Samoa and Main Hawaiian islands, specifically a wildlife response.
- Climate change – PICCC and USGS downscale modeling (1-2 km precipitation and temp models; coming out this year 2014 = impact to plant and animal systems.

- BOEM Projects include the Pacific Regional Ocean Uses Atlas, Habitat affinities and at-sea ranging behaviors among Main Hawaiian Islands (MHI) seabirds, maritime cultural resources site assessment in the MHI, and a marine biogeographic assessment of the MHI.

CNMI

- Completion of an ocean resources management plan in 2015.
- Identification of hazard mitigation programs that can be put in to a plan for funding.
- Updating State mitigation plan with mapping for Saipan, Tinian and Rota.
- Army Corps is completing its Saipan aquatic study, which will include best management practice recommendations for how to treat water before it enters lagoons.
- Collecting spatial data on historically inundated areas.
- Saipan vulnerability assessment, which will be available as a mapping application.
- Centralizing all GIS data into a structured repository and restructuring all data into geo databases and making it publicly available.