



PI RPB Data Team Kick-Off Meeting

September 8, 2016

2:00 – 3:00 PM HST

Attendees

PIRPB: Nicole Griffin (USMC), Sarah Pautzke

USFWS: Tom Mielwald

PacIOOS: Jim Potemra

USDA NRCS: Tony Ingersoll

WPFMC: Becky Walker

NOAA OCM: Gretchen Chiques

NOAA PIRO: Rob O’Conner

CNMI BECQ: Rob Greene

Ecologic: Miranda Foley

Guam CZM: Edwin Reyes

PICCC and USGS PICSC: Patrick Grady

NOAA PIFSC: Michael Parke, Bryan Dieter

UoG / PICSC liaison: Maria Kottermair

CNMI DFW: David Benavente, Frank Villagomez,
Brad Eichelberger

Hawaii OP: Joan Delos Santos

USGS: Gordon Tribble

Hawaii CZM: Justine Nihipali

CNMI CZM: Lyza Johnston

Hawaii DLNR: Bruce Anderson

Navy Postgraduate School: Arlene Guest, Tom
Murphree

Guam BSP: Roque Rosario

Opening

Ms. Sarah Pautzke briefly described the Pacific Islands RPB, describing its goal of creating a coastal and marine spatial plan based on the best available and publicly accessible information, promotes healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems and community benefits, involves stakeholders, and enables effective intergovernmental decision making. She then described what the role of the Data Team is, and what its goals could be. These goals could include determining what data are relevant for ocean planning and of that, which are available, developing a mapping interface or recommending improvements to a pre-existing one, and determining if there is an appropriate decision support tool that can be integrated into the mapping interface. Ms. Pautzke mentioned two data portals to refer to as examples:

<http://portal.midatlanticocean.org/ocean-stories/every-map-tells-a-story/>

<http://www.northeastoceandata.org/>

Each of those sites also has an interactive mapping interface.

Ms. Nicole Griffin explained that there is no defined list of data – we are starting from scratch and brainstorming. In the Pacific Islands area, we have an extensive geographic area for which much data exists. We have a grant from the Naval Postgraduate School (NPS) to help with developing a data portal, data acquisition, and developing a mapping interface; those funds are done in March 2017. The PI RPB will be looking at how data will be used, and will engage governments and stakeholders for feedback.

Ms. Griffin also described how some data will be consistently needed across jurisdictions, but other data will be jurisdiction-specific.

Work Plan

Ms. Griffin described the draft work plan, including tentative tasks for the Data Team. This work plan will be edited and then sent to the Data Team for review and input. The work plan describes the goals and objectives for the PI RPB and the Data Team, as well as deliverables.

Discussion

Mr. Bruce Anderson, Hawaii DLNR, described how the State is well into developing a water resources management plan. These efforts included extensive mapping, including a tipping point project for a network of MPAs. He expressed concern over duplicating effort. Ms. Griffin replied that the idea is to build off efforts, not duplicate them. Ms. Pautzke offered that the PI RPB's efforts are intended to build off State efforts such that the 3-200 nmi area offshore is included, as the State typically does most of its work in the coastal 0-3 nmi area.

Mr. Edwin Reyes, Guam CZM, offered that the proposed work plan provides a nice framework. He also said that they are hoping to host a Marine Planning Advancement Training (<https://nicholas.duke.edu/programs/execed/courses/mpat>) later this year to set a foundation to start the jurisdictional level coastal planning. It will be anchored in the Guam Bureau of Planning. They have not worked out yet how community engagement will occur. Regarding data, Guam has MPA data, but no data about anchorages or surface danger zones. Mr. Reyes inquired about if he could get updated MPA files as well as military build-up files. Ms. Griffin replied that there are no concrete plans at this point, but those data layers could be incorporated.

Mr. Brad Eichelberger, CNMI DFW, voiced concern about the appropriate formatting of data files. Data that are provided must be in a format usable by whichever data platform / mapping interface is chosen. It is easier for a data provider and data recipient to know what models are being considered prior to a data dump. Ms. Pautzke concurred.

Mr. Jim Potemra, PacIOOS, voiced concern about constantly changing data (i.e. data that constantly update). For example, nearshore surface water quality changes all the time, so he asked how necessary it would be to incorporate it. Ms. Pautzke and Ms. Griffin agreed. Ms. Griffin replied that while that is true about surface quality data, maybe there is another way to define and represent it, such as quarterly averages. She suggested consulting the EPA to see how they display their data effectively.

Mr. Potemra also raised the point about data sets covering long time periods because they may extend far back in time and/or extend well forward into the future through constant updates (e.g. data collected from IOOS buoys). We must be cognizant of how much temporal coverage we include in the CMSP data sets. Mr. Tom Murphree, NPS, offered that we could include all the temporal coverage we can get, but should probably start by focusing on extensive temporal coverage for conditions that have had or will have an important temporal variation (e.g. sea level, sedimentation, water quality, fishing activity, military activity, etc.). However, while there are many reasons for providing extensive temporal coverage (e.g. past helps plan for the future, planning will be more successful if it accounts for temporal variability, two conflicting activities may be able to co-exist in the same location if they are temporally different), it adds complications to data storage, access, analysis, and processing. A balance will need to be struck between providing extensive temporal data sets and a carefully-selected set of high priority temporal data sets.

Data Team Membership

Mr. Gordon Tribble, USGS, offered that the membership might depend on how much data coverage we want. He asked if we're looking from high tide mark or mountain peaks, for example. Ms. Griffin offered that we must understand the land-sea connection. Mr. Tony Ingersoll added that there is interest in sediment run-off. However, it was cautioned that this should start as a coastal to marine area effort, then get bigger and incorporate other salient data sets as necessary.

At this point, it seems the appropriate people are already included in membership.

Next Steps

There are several next steps for the team. The hope is to have an in-person meeting in Honolulu in November 2016, with a webinar option for non-local members. Between now and then, Ms. Griffin and Ms. Pautzke will work with the Data Team to develop the work plan further. Additionally, we must formalize the team, agreeing on a goal(s) and tasks, determine appropriate data sets, determine a mapping interface, and decide on a decision support tool.

Post Meeting Comments

There are two conference-type events coming up:

- 1) Coastal GeoTools conference: February 6-9, 2017, in Charleston, SC. While that is not an ideal location for a Data Team meeting, it may provide a good venue for a discussion or two among members if enough are attending.
- 2) Pacific Islands Environmental Conference: July 10-11, 2017, in Saipan. It brings together a variety of local and state government agencies, NGOs, community groups, and research institutions and universities from Guam, CNMI, and American Samoa, and may serve as an excellent opportunity to bring together at least the territorial data people to discuss data. Because it is a broad conference that seeks to accommodate everyone, it may not be specific enough to involve federal and Hawaii agency team members. Alternatively, it may provide a perfect opportunity to get the team together while keeping costs down for the territorial participants.