

Hawai‘i Ocean Resources Management Plan Working Group

Meeting Summary

September 6, 2012: 9:00am – 12:00pm
Office of Planning, 6th Floor Conference Room
235 S. Beretania Street, Honolulu, HI 96813

Present:

Leo Asuncion (OP/CZM)	Shichao Li (OP/CZM)
Cindy Barger (USACE)	Jonathan Lorenzen (OP/MACZAC)
Jim Buika (Maui Co. Planning)	Laura McIntyre (DOH/EHA/EPO)
Jim Coon (MACZAC)	Marnie Meyer (OP/CZM)
Sarah Courbis (DLNR/HHWNMS)	Bethany Morrison (Hawaii Co. Planning)
Luisa Cristini (UH Sea Grant/SOEST)	Joe Paulin (NOAA/HHWNMS)
Mark Fox (TNC)	Kenny Roberts (OP/CZM)
Jody Galinato (Kauai Co. Planning)	Sue Sakai (MACZAC)
Matt Gonser (UH Sea Grant)	Jesse Souki (OP)
	Barry Usagawa (BWS)

Cheryl Soon and April Coloretti, SSFM International

Office of Planning Welcome and Introductory Updates

Marine and Coastal Zone Advocacy Council: Jesse Souki, OP Director, announced that MACZAC is currently seeking a West Hawai‘i member and has posted a link to the application on its website. He noted that with MACZAC’s next meeting taking place on October 26th, it is very important to find a new member as quickly as possible.

Natural Estuarine Research Reserve Site: Mr. Souki also announced that the Office of Planning – Coastal Zone Management Program (OP-CZM) has been designated as the state lead for considering the possibility of establishing a Natural Estuarine Research Reserve (NERR) site within Hawai‘i. The Reserve System uses its living laboratories to find solutions to crucial issues facing America’s coasts; climate change and resilience; habitat protection; and water quality.

There is a preliminary steering committee made up of NOAA, DLNR, and UH, but additional members are needed. The certification of a NERR site has 6 steps:

- 1) Letter of interest – written by the Governor;
- 2) Site selection and nomination – including selection criteria, such as the site must be accessible to the public and allow for scientific experiments to take place;
- 3) Draft EIS and Draft Management Plan;
- 4) Final EIS and Final Management Plan;
- 5) Designation findings and certification and a Record of Decision (ROD); and
- 6) NERR Site Designation Ceremony.

Pacific Regional Ocean Partnership: The Governor’s Pacific Regional Ocean Partnership (PROP) Agreement was signed and executed last month in American Samoa by Governor Neil Abercrombie, Territory of American Samoa Governor Togiola T.A. Tulafono, CNMI Governor Benigno R. Fitial, and Territory of Guam Governor Eddie Baza Calvo.

The PROP, a living document, identifies 10 regional objectives:

1. Promote regional sustainability of resources that supports individual state requirements;
2. Facilitate the implementation of the priority objectives of the President’s Executive Order 13547 of July 19, 2010, which established the National Ocean Policy;
3. Foster cooperation and collaboration on all aspects of ocean and coastal-related research and development, education, exploration and observation, and oceans management;
4. Coordinate and communicate regional priorities;
5. Facilitate the exchange of information, including reports, discussions, initiatives and plans that may be developed or considered;
6. Facilitate preservation of the historical, cultural and social heritage of each state and the region;
7. Identify opportunities for collaborative work in the ocean and coastal environment;
8. Enhance current state, multi-state, and federal governance and institutional mechanisms to manage ocean and coastal resources;
9. Seek additional resources and funding opportunities to further the PROP’s objectives; and
10. Address related environmental issues.

Coastal Resilience Networks (CRest) Program. The CRest Program funds projects that help communities become more resilient to the threats posed by coastal hazards (which include storms, flooding, sea level rise, climate change, etc.). The ICAP CRest grant from NOAA is continuing its research on the ideas discussed with the ORMP Working Group’s Climate Change Integrated Planning Subcommittee. Their focus is integration of climate adaptation measures into Special Management Area (SMA) permitting and state land use commission decisions. This could be applied to other land use decision-making boards and commissions as well.

ORMP Working Group Discussion Session on ORMP Update – Key Points

Overview and Possible Alterations to Draft ORMP: Cheryl Soon, SSFM International, noted six key areas of the current draft that may need to be altered. These key areas were chosen for discussion because alterations to them would create a stronger, more understandable, and more aesthetically pleasing document. The six key areas mentioned were:

- 1) The addition of “Integrated” into the official document title, “The Integrated ORMP” rather than just “The ORMP”.
- 2) The addition of a statement in the introductory letter of the document, outlining that while all goals of the ORMP are important, financial restrictions may limit the ability of the ORMP to achieve all them. Barry Usagawa of BWS suggested that a disclaimer should be added. Jesse Souki suggested that such an addition would be very beneficial and said that he would send a draft introductory letter to SSFM International.
- 3) Rather than using “Priority Management Areas” (In Chapter 1 and later Chapter 6) — which makes readers think of a geographic area rather than a subject area – a new indicator should be used.
- 4) The addition in Chapter 3 of discussing unsustainable harvesting issues (reef fish and the aquarium trade) as a pressure on reef species populations. This also needs to be incorporated into Strategies 2.4, 2.7, and 2.8 contained in Goal 2: Preserve the Ocean Environment.
- 5) The addition of more emerging and pending issues to be reflected in the ORMP, and in Chapter 3, such as current petitions for:
 - a) De-listing the Green Sea Turtle (Honu) from the Endangered Species Act
 - b) Designation of Hawaiian monk seal Critical Habitat

- c) Listing 82 corals as endangered species
- 6) The Chapter 5 “Mission” of ORMP is different from the mission of the ORMP Working Group and Policy Group. This confuses the reader between the two different mission statements.

Discussion of Chapter 6 – Priority Management Areas for the Adaptation Phase

Priority Area # 1: Watershed Management

The watershed discussion needs to acknowledge that there is a difference between the Department of Health’s priority watersheds and the DLNR’s priority watersheds. For example, DLNR’s Forestry Initiative must point out that it deals with mostly upland forest where water recharges and it does not take into consideration urban areas or mid-level mixed forest, which is different from DOH-funded watershed plans, which deal with a larger portion of the ahupua’a.

Priority Area #4: Marine Invasive Species & Marine Debris

The question was raised as to whether the timeline for removing all aquatic invasive species, as well as all accumulated marine debris from Hawaii’s coastlines, by 2019 is realistic. Such a goal would require aggressive removal programs plus studies to review if the removals had been affective, both of which require significant funding.

Priority Area #5: Coral Reefs

This section should include the unsustainable harvesting of nearshore fisheries and reefs as a key component in coral reef loss. Commercial aquarium harvesting significantly reduces reef fish populations and results in an unequal balance of species. Others argued that preventing nearshore fishing would negatively impact local communities, who rely on fishing for sustenance. It was also noted that there is a misunderstanding between managing resources and prohibiting behaviors surrounding those resources and many mistakenly believe they will lose their right to nearshore fishing.

The cost of coral mitigation is so cost prohibitive, the DOT is unable to make any harbor improvements since coral begins to attach itself to manmade structures.

Priority Area #6: Aquaculture, Fishponds, and Food Sources

Need to mention unsustainable harvesting of nearshore areas. This doesn’t just include fish but also coral, seaweed, and other nearshore ocean life.

Priority Management Area #8: Conflict Resolution

This section does not treat military activities fairly and it comes off in a negative tone. This needs to be rewritten so that it is fair and balanced.

Conflict Resolution does not mention conflicts with harbors and ocean transportation are not mentioned and should be added.

Check the use of military “ordnance” vs. “ordinance” in Chapter 6.

Hawai’i does not have an ESA (Endangered Species Act)/MMPA (Marine Mammal Protection Act) coordinator like other states. Funding will be needed to establish this position if it is chosen to be created. The position is jointly funded by the federal and state government. In other states such as California, Washington, and Oregon, several state agencies pool their funds to hire this one staff position.

Priority Management Area #9: Support Existing and Create Additional Community Level Eco-Based, Place-Based Ocean Management Projects

Site determinations should be left blank or described as “including but not limited to” so that people in the future public listening sessions can suggest appropriate sites depending on the needs of the community.

DLNR has applied for funding through the Castle Foundation for a community-based project in fisheries management areas. Even without the funding they would still try to make it work.

Closing Remarks on Chapter 6

The Policy Group will need to give feedback and commitment to these priority management areas and their respective departments’ assignments.

The use of “Heritage” in Goal Two—Preserving Our Ocean Heritage—means more than just preserving the ocean’s history and culture. The World Heritage Sites, such as Papahānaumokuākea are also natural resources that integrate history and culture. “Heritage” also connotes passing down something to the next generation, and if we take care of our ocean, we are passing it down to the next generation.

Discussion of and Potential Alterations to Appendix A

Cheryl Soon provided a brief overview of the purpose of Appendix A. Appendix A is different from the Priority Management Areas. It incorporates the table from the 2006 ORMP and then makes additions per the 2009 Work Plan and the 2012 ORMP update process. Appendix A is the central guide outlining all actions, strategies, and goals of the ORMP.

Lead Agency Column: Mr. Souki suggested having better clarification of the lead agency working on a specific aspect of an “Action”. Such a clarification could be to italicize the lead agency and then list supporting agencies (“possible participating agencies” or “recommended agencies”) below it. This is vital because without a clear leader responsibility falls into the hands of everyone and no one.

It was agreed that the lead agency should be a state agency since the ORMP is state plan. However, certain currently listed lead agencies, like SOEST, are academic institutions. And can the ORMP assign actions to the county, for example wastewater management or water quantity?

Again, better clarification of the specific lead agency was a major point of discussion. For example, when listing DLNR, the division should also be listed. When listing “County”, the county agency should be listed. This creates the most transparency possible.

A possible option may be to copy other State Strategic Plans in which the agencies are listed on the left, as Primary Agency and Participating Agency, and there are checkboxes checked in a matrix if that agency is responsible.

Status Column: It was mentioned that a status column may not be needed on the ORMP since the status for all “Actions” are listed as either NEW or ONGOING. It would be necessary for tracking internally though.

Closing Remarks on Appendix A

The Policy Group will need to give feedback and commitment to these priority management areas and their respective departments’ assignments.

It was decided that the column of lead agencies needs to be “scrubbed.” All updates should be sent to Marnie Meyer.

Discussion on Performance Measures

Cheryl Soon gave a brief overview of the performance measures that would be included in the ORMP. She listed three types:

- 1) Input Measures – what you have, such as appropriated budget
- 2) Outcome Measures – what you did, such as what happened in the ocean because of planned implementations
- 3) Process Measures – how you report, such as an annual report to the legislature

Ms. Soon then went over the qualities used to determine performance measures:

- 1) Relevant
- 2) Understandable
- 3) Timely
- 4) Comparable
- 5) Reliable
- 6) Cost-Effective

It was noted that the Outcome Measures would be shown as a percentage of completion by a certain date and there would be an outcome matrix associated with the 10 Priority Management Areas (PMAs). Funding will not be tied to the Performance Measures.

How to Track Performance: During the overview of the Performance Measures, the question arose concerning how exactly performance would be tracked:

- 1) Who is tracking the Performance Measures? Who has the data? What is the baseline for each?

Certain organizations are capable of tracking specific Outcome Measures because of their current work. For example, DOH has water quality data and statistics (available soon at hawaiiidata.com) and will be able to provide information on beach cleanups, ocean bacteria levels, and days out of the year beaches were closed due to poor water quality.

Also, DLNR-DAR has limited data on fish population and health of coral reefs. There are direct measures, such as counting the number of fish, and then proxy measures, such as using fish catch trends because it is difficult to count every fish in the ocean.

It was brought up that Lead Agencies should already have, or at least be capable of acquiring the Performance Measurements specific to their ORMP assigned task. Lead Agencies should present their preferred performance measures so that it may be properly determined if they are an appropriate Lead for a certain “Action”.

It was also noted that community groups are doing a lot of good work that implements aspects of the ORMP but they are not required to report to OP or any other agency.

Closing Remarks on Performance Measures

Federal Agencies will start requiring performance measures in reporting and tie such reports directly to funding. NOAA already reports OP-CZM actions to Congress and C&C of Honolulu Environmental Services Department has MS4 Stormwater Permits which must be filed in EPA

for its annual report. Therefore, it is vitally important to determine ORMP's performance measures.

Next Steps

SSFMI International will have Performance Measures detailed for the next draft presented to the Working Group.

Next Working Group Meeting is scheduled for 9:00am Monday, October 1st at the Office of Planning Conference Room.

Following that Working Group meeting, several groups have requested to make presentations, which will be scheduled by OP.