



## **Pacific Islands RPB Teleconference**

April 22, 2014

12-2 pm HST

### RPB Members in Attendance:

American Samoa: Ruth Matagi-Tofiga

CNMI: Fran Castro, Frank Rabauliman

Guam: Joseph Cameron

Hawaii:

WPFMC: Arnold Palacios

NOAA: Mike Tosatto

JCS: Pete Smith

OSD: Nicole Griffin

EPA: John McCarroll

DOT:

DOI:

USCG:

USDA: Christine Clarke

### RPB Alternates:

DOI: Loyal Mehrhoff

USCG: Brian Hofferber

Hawaii: Leo Asuncion

### Others:

Executive Secretary: Sarah Pautzke

Hawaii CZM: Justine Nihipali

National Marine Sanctuaries: Anne Walton

JCS: Tracy Kirby

BOEM: Tracy Logan

NOAA CCMA Biography Branch: Bryan Costa

Leeway Enterprise: Miki Lee

Ocean Conservancy: Amy Trice

Surfrider: Pete Stauffer

Healthy Oceans Coalition: Sean Cosgrove  
(Conservation Law Foundation), Will Nuckols  
(W.H. Nuckols Consulting)

### AGENDA OVERVIEW

- Introductory remarks
- Review and approval of charter
- Review and approval of stakeholder engagement plan
- Data working group
- Next meeting

### Charter

The RPB members discussed the remaining issues with the charter. The first item they addressed was whether to maintain the word “productive” in Guiding Principle #3 so that the guiding principle reads “Promote environmentally responsible use of natural resources and safe, secure, and productive access

and use of coastal and ocean areas...” It was pointed out that the language was taken from the national goals for CMSP outlined in the Final Recommendations of the Ocean Policy Taskforce. No dissention was voiced for maintaining it in the guiding principle.

The second issue was whether to split Guiding Principle #3 into two due to its length. The RPB members agreed to split it into the following guiding principles:

- a) Promote environmentally responsible use of natural resources to provide long-term economic growth and stability, and
- b) Promote the safe, secure, and productive access of coastal and ocean areas.

The RPB members discussed adding a guiding principle that captures using the precautionary principle when making decisions. It was agreed that the RPB members already are tasked with operating using the precautionary principle and that the definition varies based on intent of the sentence. It was argued that the way it was used in the guiding principle was ambiguous. The RPB rejected the inclusion of a guiding principle regarding the precautionary principle.

Regarding notice of meetings, the RPB members agreed that 30 days notice was a sufficient amount of time to allow for travel arrangements and stakeholder notification. There was no dissention.

The RPB members discussed whether to include the list of their alternates in an appendix to the charter. Members agreed that the list can be an internal document maintained by the RPB members and the Secretariat and not be included in the charter.

RPB members did not object to language regarding committees and working groups that was added after the last RPB meeting.

There were no public comments regarding the charter.

There were no other charter items discussed. RPB members adopted the charter verbally and agreed to sign it at the May 20-30, 2014, RPB meeting on Guam.

### **STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PLAN**

RPB members heard the four semantics revisions made. The Executive Secretary was asked to email the track-changes version to the members. Adoption of the plan was tabled until the May RPB meeting so that RPB members could have time to review the edits.

One member stated that we need to make the best attempt to reach the most public. Public affairs officers at the agencies, particularly at the co-leads offices, could provide public announcements and print media.

Public comment received by William Nuckols was to keep this plan a living process in which adaptations can be made to stakeholder engagement. He cautioned that while feedback may not be being received currently, the process may need to evolve later as more feedback is received.

**RPB MEMBER TASK 1:** Read the plan closely. Provide comments and be prepared to adopt the plan in May.

**RPB MEMBER TASK 2:** Engage with your agency to find the best ways to disseminate information to the RPB stakeholders. Relay these ways to the Executive Secretariat.

### **DATA GROUP**

The RPB needs to begin organizing the information it needs for the planning process and developing a framework for how the end product might look. MARCO and NROC have data portals currently and had data groups started before the national CMSP process began. The data group will be a consortium of different people, including RPB members, technical staff, and management staff. They will be relying on guidance based on development of other data portals to organize Pacific Islands data into a one-stop shop.

The RPB members were asked who wanted to lead, participate, or something in between, and also how the members felt about formation of a data group now. DOD offered participation, as did American Samoa, Western Pacific Fishery Management Council, and Department of Interior. RPB members stated that they have lots of data and expertise to contribute, but felt they needed a clear understanding of the end product to know what data (as well as data precision) would be needed. DOI has plenty of data to contribute and is currently identifying a point of contact to participate.

One question raised was how the working group would coordinate with the larger RPB – would the RPB need to buy off on content? It was explained that the working group would be subordinate to the RPB and can include RPB members. One hurdle will be funding – who will pay for the portal? There would be cost to taking the first step of developing a data portal; then the portal will need maintenance (recurring funding).

The Federal Geographic Committee in DOI is charged with serving up geospatial data for the U.S. and already has data hosting capabilities. They were offered as a suggestion for data hosting.

There was no volunteer for leading the working group, so the federal co-lead (NOAA) offered to find the right person at NOAA to spearhead the group. He hopes to have the individual identified by the May RPB meeting.

**RPB MEMBER TASK 3:** Identify individuals from your agency or locale who could participate on the data working group. The individuals should be able to communicate how a data portal could be used in management (i.e. what data they would be looking for), have available data to contribute, and/or be the technical staff.

### **NEXT RPB MEETING**

The next RPB meeting is scheduled for May 29-30, 2014, at the Hilton Hotel on Guam. An agenda will be disseminated within the next week.

### **OTHER ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

In the three regions for which NOAA is a co-lead, the co-leads were asked their thoughts on the end zone for the RPBs. NOAA is visualizing what a marine spatial plan looks like. Some states have plans, like Rhode Island and Massachusetts. The CMS plan for a region would be bigger to encompass federal waters and tribal jurisdictions.

Sarah will draft a framework for ocean planning for the RPB members to review and compare to the frameworks drafted for two other regions. Development of this framework will be a large part of the May RPB meeting.

**RPB MEMBER TASK 4:** Review the frameworks when they are emailed to you. Come to the May RPB meeting prepared to develop a framework for the Pacific Islands region.

**RPB MEMBER TASK 5:** Federal members, please let Sarah know if you will be attending the May RPB meeting so she can add you to the room block. Non-federal members, please contact Sarah for travel support.