



Pacific Islands RPB Meeting

November 19-20, 2014

9am-4:30pm GST

RPB Members in Attendance:

American Samoa:

CNMI: Fran Castro

Guam: Dr. Jason Biggs

Hawaii: Jesse Souki

WPFMC:

NOAA: Michael Tosatto

JCS: CAPT Ashley Evans (USN)

DOD: Nicole Griffin (USMC)

EPA: John McCarroll

DOT: CAPT Robert Loken

DOI:

USCG:

USDA:

RPB Alternates:

American Samoa: Chris King, Selaina Tuimavave

Hawaii: Elia Herman

DOI: Deanna Spooner

USCG: CDR Brian Donahue

USDA: Tony Ingersoll, Tony Rolfes

Others and Public:

Executive Secretary: Sarah Pautzke

Facilitator: Miki Lee

Public: Tracy Kirby (USN), Rebecca Walker (WPFMC), Chris Ostrander (PacIOOS), Melissa Iwamoto (PacIOOS), Leo Asuncion (HI OP), Gretchen Chiques (NOAA NOS), Jade Delevaux (UH NREM), Hannah Springer (public), Presley Wann (public), Brian Manwaring (Udall Foundation), Syl Reck (Aha moku), Raynette Ahelroy (public), Leimana DaMate (Aha Moku Advisory Committee).

AGENDA OVERVIEW

- Introduction of RPB members and/or alternates and public; welcome from co-leads
 - RPB update
 - Discussion about a Stakeholder Engagement ACTION Plan
 - Discussion about a potential coastal and marine spatial planning (CMSP) training workshop
 - Discussion of data and tools
 - Discussion about potential CMS plan ideas
 - Further development of work plan, including adding action items, deliverables, potential staff, and measures of success
-

The meeting opened with a welcome by the co-leads, Mr. Tosatto and Mr. Souki. The RPB members and alternates, followed by the audience, then introduced themselves and stated the agency for which they work (if applicable).

RPB UPDATE

Ms. Pautzke, the Executive Secretary, provided an overview of the status of the RPB and relevant ocean planning updates. The new director of the National Ocean Council is Beth Kerttula. She is currently trying to make it to every region to meeting the co-leads and discuss the issues. Three articles pertaining to CMSP have been published: *Data Collection and Mapping – Principles, Processes, and Application in Marine Spatial Planning*; *Regional Marine Spatial Planning – The Data Collection and Mapping Process*; *UNESCO Guide to Evaluating Marine Spatial Plans*. Mr. McCarroll added that the UN Center for Biological Diversity published a report on marine spatial planning from the biological diversity perspective. Members were then 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 approved its charter and stakeholder engagement plan, held three in-person meetings and two teleconferences, and created a website to communicate about its work. The charter contains regional goals and objectives. Stakeholders and the public have been invited to, and encouraged to attend, RPB meetings. Through other venues, such as WPFMC Marine Planning and Climate Change Committee meetings and Hawaii Office of Planning Ocean Resource Management Plan Working Group meetings, the PI RPB has engaged stakeholders and members of the public.

Development of a data working group is still in progress; the Pacific Islands Region is lagging behind other regions in this effort.

Discussion

One important point raised was the issue of funding, which needs to be resolved to allow accomplishing the work. Where funds come from is undecided/unknown as of yet, but it is still important to continue to meet to share information, data, and resources. Funding requirements change depending on the activities that the PI RPB pursues. At a local level, some funding is occurring in Hawaii; however the territories need funding help.

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT ACTION PLAN

Ms. Pautzke presented about the potential need for a stakeholder engagement action plan that would include how stakeholders are engaged in each of the territories and Hawaii. The stakeholder engagement plan that was adopted by the PI RPB was not specific about what exactly will happen, when engagement will occur, and with whom. Ms. Pautzke concluded by asking if creation of territory-specific stakeholder engagement working groups would be an effective way to move forward. Organizing by area allows work to be sectioned off to the most appropriate RPB members.

Round Robin Stakeholder Engagement Discussion

Members participated in a round-robin discussion about stakeholder engagement activities done on behalf of the PI RPB. Five specific engagement activities have occurred on behalf of the PI RPB and were detailed by Ms. Pautzke. The important message coming from this discussion was that although the PI RPB was not discussed, marine spatial planning was brought up in several arenas. The State of Hawaii has been engaged in spatial planning, including using GIS to manage user conflict and resource management, incorporating it into the Ocean Resource Management Plan, and is embarking on drafting a CMS plan for the state. The Aha Moku Advisory Committee (AMAC) is attached for administrative purposes to the Department of Land and Natural Resources. The AMAC advises the chairperson of the Board of Land and Natural Resources on issues related to land and natural resources management through the Aha Moku System. This group works with local communities, who all seem to be aware of marine spatial planning and are willing to participate if provided more information.

CNMI has not had much CMSP training and has no local expertise. The staff also have limited time, but have worked with some agencies and departments to apply CMSP. Generally there is an idea about what CMSP is, but it is considered a tool to use for zoning purposes, as well as addressing user conflicts and overcrowding.

Efforts on Guam are mostly driven by the University of Guam and the WPFMC. Currently, the WPFMC is working at the village level in Merizo. UOG is drawing attention to the needs within Guam to move the topic forward, including overcrowding and user conflicts. At this point, Guam is beginning to engage more in the CMSP process, but needs training to move the effort forward. UOG is working to coalesce data, including historical data, into a GIS database.

American Samoa does not suffer the same user conflicts experienced in the other territories and Hawaii. It is village-centric with little development competition. However, the territory can learn from other efforts that are in a similar regional and geographical context (as opposed to guidance developed for non-Pacific areas). Multiple groups are collecting spatial data for planning purposes in the Pago Pago area. The Pago Pago Bay Area Plan was recently completed and the goal is to link the plan to the PI RPB's efforts. American Samoa agencies are seeking funding for various spatial planning projects.

EPA began an effort to connect regions' RPBs. At a recent meeting of the EPA representatives from the RPBs, stakeholder engagement was discussed and how it varies from region to region. New England has robust engagement (citizens, NGOs, industry representatives, etc). Mid-Atlantic is holding listening sessions with varying engagement. Mr. McCarroll suggested the PI RPB engage national and international groups such as the Coral Reef Task Force to begin exchanging information. He mentioned that the US CRTF has an RPB check-in to receive status updates from the different RPBs.

Discussion

A question that arose was how to make CMSP transparent so that people understand the data being analyzed and how decisions are made; the current process is piecemeal. Marine planning is called different things (ocean planning, regional ocean planning, CMSP, etc.), but the message is that it is a process for ocean planning that relies heavily on GIS and stakeholder engagement for decision-making.

Mr. Asuncion commented that Hawaii has an advantage because of its history of cross-agency partnerships; they did not start from scratch. The challenge for the PI RPB will be determining how best to pull information and resources together, and streamline engagement. Federal agencies will have to participate in four distinct but similar efforts, so the PI RPB should have consensus about how to engage stakeholders.

RPB members discussed that the limited number of stakeholders presented was not compelling enough to warrant formation of working groups. A suggestion was to email RPB members for their stakeholders because members felt they did not have the capacity to participate in a working group.

Regarding the process, PI RPB members encouraged remembering that the process may change over time, particularly as the PI RPB progresses from a development and writing stage to implementation and evaluation. Additionally, before engagement occurs, the reason behind the engagement must be firmed up; how that engagement occurs will depend on the work of the PI RPB.

RPB members were advised that there is no permission needed to engage stakeholders. If an opportunity arises, the member(s) should move forward. Ms. Pautzke can develop briefing materials for the members, and tailor it based on the member and/or audience. The briefing material would include who the PI RPB is, what its purpose is, and provide the most current information about the RPB's work.

The RPB may consider working with a neutral third party to help identify stakeholders, define the message, etc. Udall Foundation may be able to provide support via the Moore Foundation in the form of a stakeholder engagement assessment.

Outcomes

The PI RPB decided to wait until they had a better understanding of the reasons for engaging stakeholders before pursuing engagement. For example, are we asking stakeholders to inform the plan? If yes, then we need to start working on the plan first to have something to vet with stakeholders.

Task: Ms. Pautzke will email RPB members the stakeholder groups to fill in the blanks. Emails will be sent to individual RPB members, or specific groups (like just the Guam RPB members).

Task: RPB members will email Ms. Pautzke the stakeholder groups.

CMSP ADVANCEMENT TRAINING WORKSHOP

Ms. Pautzke presented to the PI RPB an opportunity to have a CMSP Advancement Training workshop here in the Pacific Islands. The training would be provided by Battelle Institute at cost; funding would be needed for participants' travel, fieldtrip, venue, and catering. Cost for the workshop facilitation and training would be free.

Discussion

PI RPB members asked a few questions that Ms. Pautzke said she would look into, including whether the training could be hosted on a military base, if the lunch had to be hosted or could be unhosted, and if the training could occur in Saipan, CNMI.

PI RPB members noted that training should be strategically focused; for example, the State of Hawaii already has started work on a CMS plan and also included the topic in their Ocean Resources Management Plan that was distributed widely and included extensive stakeholder input and engagement. However, other PI RPB jurisdictions could use the training, as well as some federal members. Members felt they could meet the 24 person minimum. They also voiced concern about meeting conflicts if the meeting is held in March.

Outcome

PI RPB members feel there is a benefit to the training and feel they can meet the 24 person minimum. Pros and cons exist for holding the training in CNMI versus Hawaii. More information about how many people are able to attend from each territory and state will help guide the location of the training.

Task: Ms. Pautzke will ask Battelle the questions from RPB members.

Task: Ms. Pautzke will ask RPB members who they think would/could attend the training.

DATA AND TOOLS

Mr. Asuncion of Hawaii Office of Planning provided a presentation about the Hawaii Coastal Data Exchange, which was held May 20, 2014. The event brought together 130 participants to exchange information, knowledge, and best practices regarding decision making in the coastal zone. The process the participants went through identified existing data and data gaps, as well as paired people who needed particular data with those who had that data. The plan is to host this exchange annually.

The exchange did not move toward developing data standards, but that could be a topic for future exchanges. One suggestion was that the PI RPB consider developing data standards for use within the region.

Ms. Pautzke presented about the direction the PI RPB could go with data, such as creating a data and tools working group and supporting the creation of a data portal and mapping interface. Costs associated with that include developing the platform (or enhancing an existing one), website maintenance and updating, and data gap filling. The formation of a consortium could allow for funding. Once the purpose and need of this tool is solidified among PI RPB members, elements of existing platforms, such as PaclOOS, EnerGIS, and PICCC, might be modified to meet these requirements.

The data working group would identify relevant data and data gaps, determine what data platforms are available or could be built or improved upon, determine costs of proposed actions, and then bring recommendations to the PI RPB for approval and action. The data working group may also be responsible for data sharing agreements. The Federal Co-lead has potentially found a project lead within NOAA (Ben Reder, Ocean and Coastal Services Center).

Discussion

An RPB member asked who would decide what goes into the portal – whether it would be open to all data or the data would be moderated. MARCO and NROC formed working groups to identify available data and data gaps, determine what data would be relevant for a CMSP data portal and mapping interface, and execute data sharing agreements. The PI RPB was encouraged to form a working group by the federal co-lead.

Funding was raised as an impediment to creating the portal and mapping interface. Funding initially could come from NOAA and possibly other federal agencies, as well as private foundations.

Other issues raised included the question of who potentially owns the data portal, how important it is to have a portal and manage it versus pointing people to data and other portals, and that the first priority should be determining the plans and priorities then having the data to support it. The question was also raised about whether it is the PI RPB's role to create the data portal. In other areas, the data portal and mapping interface is hosted by the regional ocean partnership, not the RPB. However, the regional ocean partnerships are also very strong in New England and the Mid Atlantic.

It was suggested that perhaps the best first step is to identify what data is missing and define what we think a data working group's scope of work and function might be. Concern was voiced that a lack of progress regarding data and a data working group will slow down the work of the PI RPB.

Outcome

The consensus decision was to not create a data working group at this time until more work regarding Objective 1, Best Available and Publicly Accessible information, was completed and until the group is more comfortable about its end product.

COASTAL AND MARINE SPATIAL PLANS

Ms. Pautzke described how plans are developing in New England and the Mid Atlantic. The NE RPB provided a draft outline of a Northeast Ocean Plan containing an introduction, planning area characterization, plan implementation, and a science plan and described what each of those sections contain. The MA RPB provided a more thorough options paper for 5 ways the RPB could tackle a plan: issue-triggered coordination process, compatibility assessment, targeted coordination by issue or geography, compatible use areas, and comprehensive optimal use maps. They ruled out the first and last option, then detailed what potentially could be contained in sections of the plan. Any of the three remaining options could contain an introduction, framework for ocean planning, regional ocean assessment, data and analysis, implementation plan, plan updates, inter-jurisdictional coordination process, monitoring strategy, and iteration process.

Also presented to the PI RPB were plan outlines from the completed Rhode Island Special Area Management Plan (SAMP), Oregon Territorial Sea Plan (TSP), and Massachusetts Ocean Resource Management Plan. There were some consistent details within each plan, such as consistency with current state and federal regulations and descriptions of the plan's goals and objectives. However, the amount of information contained in each plan varied. The Rhode Island SAMP is over 1,000 pages, while the Oregon TSP is less than 300 pages.

Discussion

It is difficult to discuss how the plan will develop when the PI RPB is not yet clear about its end goal. PI RPB members thought about what a compelling success story for itself might look like to motivate and inform actions: what will the PI RPB affect that will be different than it is today? PI RPB members discussed what the needs of the region are and the end goal. For example, this process should guide permit and use decisions and siting actions, point to and/or provide data, define environmental outcomes, be a guiding document for how to overcome situations involving incompatible uses, and provide guidance for priorities to aid resolution of conflicts.

After much discussion around members being unclear about the end game of the PI RPB (data portal, work plan, CMS plan?), it was decided that Day 2 of this meeting would contain a discussion and decision about the purpose of the CMS plan. PI RPB members were tasked with thinking overnight about what the RPB is providing, what current or future needs and/or conditions could be addressed, what problems (process or environmental) the PI RPB plan would address, what the plan would NOT do, and who the audience is for the plan.

CMS Plan Discussion

The morning of Day 2, the PI RPB members began their discussion to determine the purpose of the plan. Issues must be identified that the plan would address and the plan should provide guidance instead of recreating a wheel. The plan must also be consistent with local plans. PI RPB members were reminded that the Pacific Region is unique regarding culture and traditions, so an exemplary plan would incorporate and prioritize those aspects, as well as national security and the overall sustainability of the region. The plan could reference issues and priorities already identified in the Pacific Islands Regional Climate Assessment. Lastly, the plan should provide a backbone for feasibility studies to ensure no show stoppers for developers.

A PI RPB member asked if the RPB will be active in 10 years. If the answer is yes (and should be), then the plan should be a living document that is reassessed every few years to determine its efficacy and evaluate the PI RPB's success. Methods for evaluating that success should be included in the plan. One method could be identifying how many projects have been proposed, how many were implemented, and how many failed due to unforeseen show stoppers.

The plan would not be intended to zone. Regulatory areas already exist, so those could be identified in the plan, but the plan itself would not create zones. It also would not create any new regulations. The plan will help local or federal decisions, and help inform end users, so it would also not be a blanket Pacific Island wide general plan. End users including canoe racers, wind energy projects, government agencies, researchers, resource advocates, project proponents, and ocean users

The plan would include federal guidelines. It would not necessarily detail all the activities that cannot be taken, but would identify what actions would need to be taken if a project were pursued, including who the action agencies are. It could also point stakeholders to data. Stakeholders, including agencies, could do their jobs better because all the data are known, like ecological and human use data. Site-specific information would be useful, and regional information is also useful. CMSP is a tool to resolve conflicts over space and resources in the ocean. So, an end product could include policies and procedures for garnering space for an activity, and another end product could be a spatial information delivery package for visualizing current uses.

The PI RPB plan would detail current uses, water quality conditions, natural resources, and natural resources' status, as well as existing policies. It would describe potential the future status of water quality, natural resources, winds, waves, currents, and other facets of climate change. The plan would describe predicted future uses, including shoreline populations.

PI RPB members drafted the following statement to define its end product, the purpose of its CMS Plan:

The PI RPB's primary product is a guidance document for use by ocean users, resource advocates, and government agencies. The document takes into account current and future conditions (e.g. environmental, economic, social, and security) and uses for planning purposes.

The guidance document is intended to provide information on how to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts early in the process for a proposed activity; provide guidance on where to acquire data and other information; identify sources of policies and procedures; increase meaningful participation for process participants; and enhance government coordination.

As a way to begin work towards plan development, the PI RPB broke into two subgroups. Subgroup 1 explored the plan format and structure, while Subgroup 2 worked on the objectives.

Sub-Group 1: Plan Format and Structure

Subgroup 1 consisted of John McCarroll, Fran Castro, Jason Biggs, Selaina Tuimavave, and Nicole Griffin. The group put the actions items aside, and worked with the objectives with the end product in mind. They provided a new name and the document consists of six parts plus appendices:

U.S. Pacific Islands RPB Ocean Plan and Guidance

Part I. Introduction and Background

- Framework
 - National Ocean Policy
 - History of PI RPB
- Vision and Mission
- Guiding Principles
- Goals and Objectives – PI RPB Goal
- PI RPB Structure

Part II. Description of States and Territories

- Include major drivers (e.g. tourism, fishing, uses of ocean, etc.)

Part III. Regulatory Context (description of how ocean planning intersects with agency authority)

- Existing statutes, regulations and policies
- Stakeholder involvement, priorities and rights
- Integrated intergovernmental decision making

Part IV. Best Available and Publicly Accessible Information

- Existing Data Sources

Part V. Healthy Oceans (the “outcome/end result”)

- Challenges
 - Climate change
 - Ocean Acidification
 - Fishing Pressures (commercial, over-exploitation of food stocks, etc.)
- How to Overcome Challenges

Part VI. Measuring Effectiveness

Appendices

- 1) Charter
- 2) Maps
- 3) NOP
- 4) Data

Sub-Group 1: Review of Draft Objectives, Outcomes, and Products

Subgroup 1 consisted of Jesse Souki, Ash Evans, Deanna Spooner, Elia Herman, Brian Donahue, Tony Rolfes, and Chris King. The group made some modifications to the description of the objectives in the Work Plan, deleted material that might be appropriate elsewhere, and redefined the outcomes and products:

Objective 1: Best available and publicly accessible information

Provide the best available and publicly accessible information on the condition and uses occurring within coastal and marine ecosystems.

Objective 2: Stakeholder involvement, priorities, and rights

Involve stakeholders and reflect local, regional, and cultural priorities and rights in the development of the CMS Plan. ~~Whereas the purpose of Objective 1 is to provide information to stakeholders so that they are equipped to understand regional ocean planning issues, the purpose of this objective is meaningful participation by stakeholders and operating in such a way that reflects the unique cultural attributes of the Pacific Islands region.~~

Objective 3: Integrated intergovernmental decision-making

The third objective is to enable effective, holistic and integrated intergovernmental decision-making regarding productive uses that supports compatibility, access, commerce, and security in the coastal and marine environment.

Objective 4: Promote healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems

The fourth objective is to promote healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems that function to provide desired benefits to the communities.

INCLUDE THIS LANGUAGE (PROCESS OUTCOME 4-1) under Objective 4 – “Through coordinated and collaborative planning efforts, perpetuate biodiversity and maintain the ability of the region’s ocean and coastal ecosystems to provide provisioning (food and supplies), regulating services such as flood control, cultural services and benefits, and supporting ecosystem services such as nutrient cycling.”

Outcomes:

1. Informed government and non-government stakeholders who participate in coordinated coastal and ocean planning in the Region
2. Transparent management processes informed by science
3. An ethos that reflects the unique Pacific Islands region socio-cultural attributes
4. Measured and inclusive participation by diverse interested parties and agencies in the PI RPB – *Will this still be relevant once document is done? Is this appropriate to include?*

Products:

- 1) Dynamic, relevant RPB website
- 2) Informed and responsive regional stakeholder engagement program
- 3) Flow chart documenting the marine planning processes in the Pacific Region
- 4) Consistent and repeatable channels of communication between regional coastal and marine planning agencies
- 5) Catalog of regional coastal and marine planning resources and data sources.

Task: Ms. Pautzke will review existing documentation, including the Final Recommendations and the Implementation Plan, to ensure no major requirements were missed.

Task: Ms. Pautzke review the outcomes and products to ensure that they fit the objectives under each goal and are achievable, realistic, and measurable.

Task: Ms. Pautzke will repackage the work of Groups 1 and 2 and distribute the resulting document to the PI RPB for review and propose the actions necessary to complete the CMS plan, focusing on the next phase of development.

MEETING WRAP-UPS

PI RPB members were urged to think of ways to move forward instead of re-hashing material that has already been reviewed. Energy must be spent now moving forward, so members should expect the next phase of work to feel different – it will be less passive, mostly action-oriented and prescriptive, and will require more commitment from RPB members.

Mr. McCarroll provided a presentation about ocean acidification. He provided a one-page summary that described the problem, its background, what actions are currently underway, and what more could be done. Ocean acidification is increasing due to increased CO₂ emissions; increased CO₂ leads to decreased calcium carbonate available for organisms with shells, making it unlikely they will survive to adulthood. At current emissions, coral reef structures are expected to disappear within several decades. Actions being taken by the US government, the US Coral Reef Taskforce, and non-governmental groups were described, as well as more that could be done at the national, regional, and local levels.