



American Samoa Ocean Planning Team

Meeting Summary

March 7-9, 2018

Outcomes

- Developed American Samoa Ocean Plan content further
- Incorporated feedback from 2017 Fall listening sessions and the 2018 PI RPB meeting
- Determined content for the next ASOPT meeting

Day 1: March 7

Attendees: Atuatasi Peau, Fatima Sauafea-Leau, Brian Peck, Chris King, Tanner Stiehl, Miranda Foley, Sarah Pautzke, Hideyo Hattori, Krista Corry, Mike McDonald, Burg Salanoa, Ti'a Reid, Tufanua Mase

Day 2: March 8

Attendees: Atuatasi Peau, Archie Soliai, Nate Ilaoa, Christinna Lutu-Sanchez, Brian Peck, Chris King, Tanner Stiehl, Miranda Foley, Sarah Pautzke, Hideyo Hattori, Krista Corry, Mike McDonald, Burg Salanoa, Ti'a Reid, Tufanua Mase, Sandra Lutu

Day 3: March 9

Attendees: Atuatasi Peau, Nate Ilaoa, Christinna Lutu-Sanchez, Brian Peck, Chris King, Tanner Stiehl, Miranda Foley, Sarah Pautzke, Hideyo Hattori, Krista Corry, Mike McDonald, Burg Salanoa, Ti'a Reid, Tufanua Mase, Sandra Lutu

PI RPB FEBRUARY 2018 MEETING UPDATES PROVIDED TO THE ASOPT

The PI RPB meeting was held February 14-15, 2018, in Honolulu, Hawaii. In attendance included the American Samoa representatives Henry Seseapasara (member) and Chris King (alternate). Of importance to the ASOPT, the PI RPB agreed to put its remaining Moore Foundation funds towards completion of the AS Ocean Plan (ASOP), as well as put most of the PI RPB Coordinator's attention towards completion of the ASOP (while pushing off additional PI RPB tasks).

The other important note is that because of the input from the American Samoa members, the Guam and CNMI members have decided that it is important to get the stakeholder assessment complete at the outset of ocean planning in their jurisdictions, and that the coastal and marine spatial planning training should be sought for those territories.

The PI RPB provided feedback on the ASOP objectives and the plan in general, which was woven into the feedback the ASOPT received in this meeting.

ASOPT REVIEW OF ASOP GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The ASOPT reviewed the goals and their associated objectives to address input received from the stakeholder and community listening sessions held in September/October 2017, as well as questions that arose during drafting of the American Samoa Ocean Plan (ASOP). The ASOPT first reviewed the plan content at the 'Goals' level. The review of the "Objectives" is described later in detail.

Goal 1: Healthy Ocean and Coastal Ecosystems

There was a suggestion to add *watershed*. There was not consensus about whether *coastal* and *watershed* were the same terms. Extensive conversation occurred around the definition of coastal, which includes watershed in Coastal Zone Management Act. The AS Ocean Resource Management Plan had different delineations, and called watershed the high tide mark up to the mountains and nearshore waters from the high tide mark to 3 nm offshore. The DOC Planning Department does not specifically call out watersheds.

NOAA supports a watershed coordinator for its conservation efforts at AS DMWR because many villages are watershed based, and much of the work managing land-based sources of pollution are watershed centric. It was suggested that we be consistent with existing legislation regarding the definition of watershed.

ASOPT Recommendation: include *watershed* in a list of descriptions, and that maybe include it at the objective level, but not within the goal.

Goal 2: Sustainable Ocean and Coastal Uses

Input received from the listening sessions included ensuring that the actions are not just planned, but also funded. It was also suggested to include clear responsibilities of the agencies. A task that was suggested was upgrading infrastructure.

There were no changes to this goal.

Goal 3: Promote Fa'a Samoa

The PI RPB suggested making this Goal 1. The idea is that instead of making it look like an afterthought as Goal 3, even though the goals are not in order of importance, the perception could be that it was an afterthought. There was discussion about leaving it as Goal 3, making it Goal 1, changing its language, and/or elevating it to guiding principle. Several people provided alternative language to Miranda during the meeting.

A small group was tasked to fill out the following table to deliberate the pros and cons of proposed changes:

Goal 3	Pros	Cons
No change – stays Goal 3	Recognized as important enough to be its own goal	Looks like an afterthought
Goal 3 is reworded	Specify/clarify fa'a Samoa in terms of traditional practices	Takes away from the work already put in
Goal 3 is elevated to a guiding principle	All-encompassing principle to the entire plan; becomes intertwined into objectives and actions	We only have 2 goals in the plan. This is late in the process to make this change. Might be structurally inconsistent.

Moved to Goal 1	Makes it more of a priority.	Misses the focus on and overall intention of the ASOP
Tasks are assimilated into other goals and its elevated to a guiding principle	Refocuses the purpose and intent of plan.	Lose the call to action and objectives.

After creating the table, the small group recommended making *fa'a Samoa* a guiding principle and transferring the objectives and actions to other goals and the entire plan.

ASOPT Recommendation: The ASOPT concurred to elevate *fa'a Samoa* as a guiding principle, transfer actions under the goal to Goal 2: Sustainable....Uses, and incorporate *fa'a Samoa* into the plan overall.

ASOPT Recommendation: Regarding how to correctly write *fa'a Samoa*: yes it is italicized, but regarding capitalization, Sarah was tasked with asking Okenaisa Fauolo of the American Samoa Community College.

The ASOPT then delved into the “Objectives” over the course of two days. In small groups, ASOPT members reviewed the objectives and actions to ensure they were spatial in nature. Below is a summary of the comments and recommendations.

Goal 1 – Objective 1: Manage species and habitats to maintain and/or restore healthy ecosystems and natural beauty.

A suggestion from the listening sessions was to add *protect* after *manage*. There was agreement to add *protect*, but to make the objective: *Manage species and habitats to protect, maintain, and/or restore healthy ecosystems and natural beauty.*

Other listening session suggestions included: 1) understanding the federal and ASG boundaries will help with respect to the Fono and local culture, 2) areas that are prohibited will help with awareness, 3) CZM worked with villages to talk about issues (e.g. dynamite fishing), 4) protect spawning areas from encroaching, and 5) enforcement is key.

The ASOPT also discussed adding to the language to reflect the nearshore ecosystems. It was also pointed out that this is not a management plan, yet the objective begins with “manage”. Lastly, regarding Action 1-3, working with agencies to define *ecologically rich* then develop an attribute table, an ASOPT member suggested that AS DMWR may already have the information that was cited from the Mid Atlantic Plan Appendix 4.

ASOPT Recommendation:

- Make the objective: *Manage species and habitats to protect, maintain, and/or restore healthy ecosystems and natural beauty.*
- Add to preamble to reflect that we are discussing wet habitats because the objective itself does not define the footprint.
- Add ‘ocean and coastal’ to ecosystems
- Action 1. Add spatial
- Action 3.1-3.4. Map species, not identify

Goal 1 – Objective 2: Prevent, eliminate, and/or mitigate land-based and marine sources of pollution.

Listening session suggestions include:

- Bring federal fines back to AS
- Think about EPA, permits, sewer lines
- Identify places with new problems
- Integrate into action plans that enforce pollution
- Get village/ pulenu'u involved in long term
- Ties to land increase pollution prevention
- Trash survey of visa holders; awareness training
- Objective 2 is a good statement, but how does one mitigate?
- Regulations already cover pollution prevention for businesses
- After rains, pulenu'u can work with villages

Small group feedback regarding objective 2:

- The existing actions read more like a management plan than a decision-making tool. Concern around the question of *who* will be implementing the strategies outlined in the actions.
- Change the language of the objective to: Prevent, eliminate, and/or mitigate land-based, watershed, nearshore (harbor included), and marine sources of pollution.
 - Possibly reword altogether to something like: "...pollution affecting our oceans" and strike "land-based, nearshore,..."
- Remove Action 1 because it's repetitive with the objective and make the tasks 1-6 into new action items. Delete #4 because it doesn't fit well (cost-benefit analysis on full lifecycle costs of plastics).
- Mappable items include:
 - Common sources of pollution: i.e. rivers and streams emptying into the harbor
 - Nearshore areas around the island that empty into the coast
 - Existing Enforcement Agencies and their jurisdictions (identify gaps and overlaps)
 - Map of past spills, cleanups
- Action #3: strike "Include"; replace with "Increase and Enhance....." *outreach for improved source controls and link to efforts currently underway*
- List of existing enforcement agencies:
 - Fed: USCG, USEPA
 - Local ASEPA (lead), DMWR, DPA, DPS, Public Health, DOC

ASOPT Recommendations:

- 1) Amend objective to say *Prevent, eliminate, and/or mitigate land-based, watershed, nearshore (and harbor), and marine sources of pollution affecting our oceans*
- 2) Action 1: Reword to state *Identify existing laws, jurisdictions, programs, and plans*. Correspond with those efforts.
 - a. Incorporate decision-making tools and maps into Action 1
 - b. Include tasks to map enforcement efforts/jurisdictions and sources of pollution within those jurisdictions

- 3) Make the original Action 1 tasks into actions (Action 1: *Develop a strategy for marine debris and pollution reduction*) and delete original Action 1 language

Goal 1 – Objective 3: Account for ocean ecosystem changes and increased risks.

Listening session suggestions include:

- Docks
- Bridges and streams
- Stream sedimentation

Suggestions by the ASOPT in response include moving docks and bridges to Goal 2 regarding uses, and keeping stream sedimentation response in Goal 1.

Relate input to goal 2.

Add coastal and watershed to any obj.

The ASOPT made no changes to the objective.

- 1) **ASOPT Recommendations:** Regarding the original language, *Enhance or maintain climate change adaptation and resilience*, the ASOPT recommended keeping the language but moving into an action.
- 2) In current action 2: amend to “*Identify existing local and regional initiatives*” to address the proposed initiatives
- 3) Actions 3 and 4: strike and make them a task. These also may relate to Goal 2, objective 2.
- 4) Replace ‘account’ with ‘spatially plan for’. Add study area to objective.
- 5) Action 1. Change ‘map’ to “Coordinate existing efforts to...map”

Goal 2– Objective 1: Encourage sustainable and appropriate coastal, nearshore/reef, and open ocean development and uses.

An ASOPT member provided the following list of agencies to add to this objective: NOAA (PIRO, OLE, Weather Service), Office of the Governor, ASPA, DOI (OIA, USFWS), EPA, DMWR, Homeland Security, Treasury (Customs), Legal Affairs (Immigration), Dept. of Agriculture, Department of Health, Department of Port Administration, Shipyard Services Authority, Department of Parks and Recreation, OSA, AS Visitors Bureau, Swains Island (Jennings Family), and Department of State.

A group of ASOPT members amended the list of uses, dividing them into “near” and “far”. It was noted that the activities were designated based on where the activity primarily takes place, but that there are some anomalies. The table was emailed to Miranda for incorporation into the ASOP.

ASOPT recommendations regarding the actions:

- 1) Action 1: Keep it the same, but ensure the emphasis is on linking/coordinating the local and federal uses and information.
- 2) Action 2: Move it to the bottom of all the actions.
- 3) Action 3: Keep it the same.
- 4) Actions 4 and 5: combine these by inserting “economic” before “development” in current Action 4, to read “*Identify areas appropriate for specific types of economic development and future uses.*”

Goal 2– Objective 2: Spatially plan for and implement measures to ensure ocean, coastal, social, and economic resilience.

The ASOPT talked about paring down the language because it got wordy during the ASOPT meeting. For example, one suggestion was to start with “Plan, develop, and implement...” It was also stated that the data portal is the key for this objective, and it could link to the territorial response plan.

ASOPT Recommendations:

- Edit language to: Spatially plan nearshore and open ocean resources and uses to ensure economic resilience in the following 3 use areas: 1) subsistence and village-based activities, 2) economic development and commercial use, and 3) recreation and research/education.
- Action 1: Identify existing coastal and hazard mitigation plans (DMWR, TEMCO (AS DHS), NOAA NWS, DOC, PA, USCG)
 - Task 1: Identify and address gaps
- Replace Action 2 with: Protect existing infrastructure and uses in response to high sea levels, storms, and other coastal hazards
- Delete Action 3. Look back at the climate change initiative
- Add a new Action 3: Adapt plans for future infrastructure development in response to high sea levels, storms, and other coastal hazards.

Goal 2– Objective 3: Enhance, promote, and maintain sustainable traditional values, knowledge, and practices on island.

The ASOPT intentionally emphasized “*sustainable* traditional” uses to focus on actions that are now known to be safer for the environment or minimally impactful to natural resources, as opposed to just saying “traditional.”

A small group recommended adding a fourth action to the list of actions so that outreach is incorporated.

ASOPT Recommendation:

- Add Action 4: Provide education/outreach of spatial tools and identified spatial footprints of traditional practices to villages.

Goal 3: Promote Fa’a Samoa

Stakeholder recommendations included putting Samoans in charge of actions and introducing traditional ocean uses to youth at an early age. The ASOPT will work to identify agencies involved in actions, especially ASG and OSA.

The ASOPT reconfirmed that the goal of this plan is to ensure that ocean uses are taken into account during future permitting activities, but not actually to perform or introduce a use. If someone wanted to introduce a traditional ocean use to a youth group, the spatial footprint of the use could be documented and provided to project proposers as information regarding their proposed spatial footprint such that conflict between the uses is mitigated.

ASOPT COMMENT REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The ASOPT members conducted an e-mail review of the draft ASOP prior to the March ASOPT meeting. There were several questions or comments from that review that required in-person ASOPT member discussion. These items were assigned to small groups during the ASOPT meeting for incubation and

recommendations. The small group report outs were then presented to the full ASOPT for review and acceptance. The accepted recommendations are described below.

1) *What should the titles look like in the list of participants? Should we include titles at all?*

The ASOPT agreed to include matai titles as well as agency titles.

ASOPT TASK: Sarah will email ASOPT members regarding their matai and agency titles for inclusion in the list of participants.

2) *Appendices:*

- a. Overview of federal and ASG regulations: provide links
- b. List of agencies and statutory authority: ASG website and overview that includes 1) 3-4 agencies with titles, 2) description of how PNRS solves conflicts, 3) regulations pertaining to sanctuaries, monuments, MSA, etc. and 4) a key regulations overview (e.g. CZMA, etc).
- c. Data and mapping information: provide as much as practical, but there's no limit on the number of maps. Current maps should be in the body of the plan, with maps of boundaries in the body, but changing maps in the appendix. Priority maps are to be determined.
- d. We won't include the entire CONCUR stakeholder assessment report, just the link to the full report. But, we will include the executive summary in English and Samoan.
- e. To what extent do we call out stakeholders – types, names, etc? We will document the public outreach dates/times/locations and as many people as possible. Include apology for missing people.
- f. Regarding the National Ocean Policy: include a link, but no summary unless there's an existing 1-2 page summary.
- g. PI RPB Charter: include by link
- h. Laws, policies, and statutes should remain separate from recommendations from task forces and other bodies.

3) *PNRS Section in Introduction*

PNRS is responsible for permitting from ridge to 3 mi offshore. CZMA forces consistency for actions beyond 3 miles. Is there a link between the two?

TASK: Burg Salanoa to help add a link in the ASOP to the PNRS website, describe the PNRS function, and create a flow chart.

4) *Diagram of ocean planning timeline?*

No. The existing one is sufficient.

5) *How much PI RPB history do we include?*

Include all history in the ASOP body to build a foundation and to get a sense of the effort. Include the Governor's letters and the initial invite letter in the appendix. Include a timeline of the PI RPB's efforts; include the link to the meeting history. Document ASG's participation and willingness to participate. Discuss the different jurisdictions, members, include the charter by link, structure and operations, and key decisions.

6) *How much ASOPT history do we include?*

Include the ASOPT establishment, members, link to meeting history, stakeholder engagement, and the AS Plan development process and milestones.

7) *Do we want a deeper summary of the stakeholder engagement that occurred during ASOP development?*

Include the listening session summary in the appendix, but reference the appendix in the introduction section that relates to stakeholder engagement.

8) *Should the ASOP discuss and outline processes for future stakeholder engagement? What would it look like? How specific should we be given each agencies' existing mandates? Is the target to inform agencies as well as permittees? Include a brief summary that captures the recommendations by CONCUR? Frame as suggestions for future engagement?*

This could be simple, such as a table of agencies and their respective stakeholder engagement processes (including links) in the appendix. It can also include village level engagement. We could also create a table in the appendix that identifies steps, by use, that a developer would need to take, such as contacting the mayor of the impacted village(s), PNRS, and others (e.g. when buying a new alia to longline, have a table that takes into account the different activities – business licenses from AS DOC, commercial fishing permit from AS DMWR, commercial longline permit from NOAA PIRO). It can also detail that PNRS will automatically flag whether you'll need a permit, zoning, business license, etc. Uses typically have overlapping jurisdictions – this plan can become a one-stop shop, particularly if it describes the benefits to the users of the plan.

In the introduction, we should focus on how everyone is a stakeholder, as well as focus on uses. Then briefly discuss existing agency frameworks.

TASK: Nate, Andrew Berquist (IT, Treasury), Sandra, Burg, Chrissy

9) *Define the study area*

After extensive discussion over two days, the ASOPT agreed that the outer limit of the plan would extend to the AS EEZ. The plan would begin its unique spatial planning effort at the shoreline (mean high water mark), however the overall extent includes other related planning efforts within the coastal area. The discussion also acknowledged the existing planning efforts within the geographic scope of the shoreline out to the EEZ.

ASOPT Recommendation: The study area is comprised of three zones, which are used throughout the plan:

1. Coastal: sometimes referred to as watershed, this zone includes land and streams from the mountain ridge tops down to the high tide water line.
2. Nearshore/reef: extends from the high tide water line out to 3 nm, or the extent of the territorial waters.
3. Ocean: extends from 3 nm to the outer extent of the EEZ, or up to 200 nm.

ASOPT Recommendation: The ASOPT agreed that the ASOP includes shoreline planning (e.g. seawalls, revetments), but excludes land use planning and permitting that already exists.

10) *Where do we reference the Deeds of Cession? In the fa'a Samoa goal?*

It was suggested to capture this in the appendix, but also capture the spirit of the Deeds of Cession throughout the plan, particularly the introduction. We need to ensure our summary covers what is given to American Samoa and the unique relationship with the U.S.

ASOPT Recommendation: Include the Deeds of Cession in the appendix and reference throughout the document.

11) *Wordsmith paragraph regarding American Samoa governance on page 23.*

Sandra provided language:

Traditional village governance is a powerful dynamic of regional governance with far reaching influence on all aspects of society. Coordination between agencies in the absence of engaging traditional governance leaders is a common impediment to overall resource land use management. American Samoa governance responsibilities are layered and shared between government elected officials and traditional governance. The direct relationship between overall governance and the traditional land tenure system (lands and surrounding ocean), if effectively woven with elected officials, is key to effective coastal resource management and initiatives.

12) *Goal 1, Objective 2, Action 5: refine paragraph about enforcement with respect to USCG and/or local enforcement agencies.*

Both federal and state agencies are involved in enforcement actions. The list is above.

13) *Goal 1, Objective 2, Action 1.3: Talk about source pollution efforts. Also, provide further language for "DOC developed a BMP for coastal land use back in 2012; this might be a good document to cite here."*

The 2011 Erosion and Sediment Best Practices Guidebook was designed to help development consider sediment during construction. The LAS Working Group developed it and members of the ASOPT that are also on the LAS working group will follow up.

TASK: Hideyo will find the guidebook and forward that with a summary blurb to Sarah and Miranda to put into the ASOP.

(https://www.epa.as.gov/sites/default/files/documents/surface/esc_fieldguide_complete_small_11044.pdf)

14) *Review list of uses and categories (village, commercial, recreation). Is there a need to tease out "traditional" or "customary practices"? If yes, what would it look like? 14 and 15 were combined in the small group.*

15) *Review provided list of uses to add traditional and/or customary practices.*

14 and 15 were combined in the small group. It was suggested we add a fourth group that separates cultural fishing and culture sites, such as the akule runs and Shark and Turtle.

Chart out near/far uses with villages

A group of ASOPT members amended the list of uses, dividing them into "near" and "far". It was noted that the activities were designated based on where the activity primarily takes place, but that there are some anomalies. The table was emailed to Miranda for incorporation into the ASOP. Most uses are nearshore, some are far, and even fewer uses are a combination of both.

16) *Goal 3: revise the description*

ASOPT Recommendations:

- Take out "local and federal agencies"

- Change *ways to practices*
- Change *follow to maintain*

17) *Revise Goal 1, Objective 3:*

Make the original language an action. Change language of objective 3 to *spatially plan* instead of *account*. And, add “*spatially plan*” to a glossary. Include the whole study area.

18) *Goal 2, Objective 2: Anticipate impacts of projected coastal hazards to villages and land ownership/use*

Change *anticipate impacts* to *spatially plan for*.

19) *Goal 3: Promote Fa’a Samoa*

This was elevated to a guiding principle after a pros/cons worksheet was filled out by a small group. The discussion is above.

ADDITIONAL ASOPT DISCUSSION OF ASOP

The ASOPT recognized the need to connect the ASOP with ‘security’, which is specifically called out in the vision statement. While the specific reference at the time was to homeland security, the ASOPT pointed out it also includes food security and coastline security. This would reflect this current U.S. federal government Administration’s efforts to strengthen U.S. economic and national security.

TASK: Sarah will add an objective or actions to an already-existing objective to the ASOP regarding security.

The ASOPT agreed to consider swapping the healthy ecosystems goal with the sustainable economy goal to reflect this current Administration’s efforts to create conditions for economic growth and opportunity.

There was a suggestion to move the use tables to the appendices instead of taking up 3 pages of space with them.

DATA TEAM UPDATES PROVIDED TO THE ASOPT

The PI RPB’s Data Team has been working with the Naval Postgraduate School (NPS) to develop a prototype data portal. The portal is fairly advanced in its development. The NPS has acquired data from American Samoa, but are still incorporating it.

ASOPT members who are participants on the Data Team include Edgar Apulu, Gina Faiga, and Sandra Lutu. At this meeting, additional participants have been added, including Mike McDonald, Nate Ilaoa, Joe Meredith, and Grace Felise.

ASOPT Action: Additional participants volunteered, including Mike McDonald, Nate Ilaoa, Joe Meredith, and Grace Felise (Joe and Grace were volunteered by Sandra).

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT UPDATE PROVIDED TO THE ASOPT

The ASOPT was given a recap of the October listening sessions conducted with targeted stakeholder groups and villages on Tutuila, Ofu, Olesega, and Ta’u. Henry was team lead for the stakeholder engagement within the villages. The summary of the engagement is on the PI RPB website.

The ASOPT discussed who should lead the next round, whether the coordinator should be involved for conversations with the Fono and OSA, and timing.

ASOPT Recommendations:

- The ASOPT lead should brief the Governor, Fono, and OSA between ASOPT meetings as well as at the start of the next round of listening sessions.
- The coordinator could attend a meeting with the Governor, but it must be led by Henry
- Do not have the next round of stakeholder engagement the week of June 11 because it conflicts with a major fisheries meeting. Manua meetings are not advised from July 9 through July 20.

NEXT STEPS

- Sarah will doodle poll for next ASOPT meeting
- Next meeting agenda:
 - Plan adoption and implementation will be further refined based on language added after this meeting
 - Plan for next big round of stakeholder engagement

TIMELINE

2018	Action
April	PI RPB Data Team input into objectives, actions, and tasks
May	ASOPT meeting
June/July	Update plan based on Data Team input and ASOPT meeting changes
	Early June: draft plan to stakeholders for review
	Late June / Early July: Next round of stakeholder engagement
	Update plan based on engagement
July / August	Possible teleconference to discuss stakeholder engagement results
September	Plan to PIRO Communications Department for turning into final product
December	Final ASOP!
January 2019	Last round of stakeholder engagement to demonstrate the plan