

**FAGATELE BAY NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY
Sanctuary Advisory Council Meeting Minutes**

Tuesday, November 9, 2010

DOC Conference Room

1:00-3:00PM

Participants

1. Dean Hudson, *Chair/Ocean Recreation*
2. Nu'utai Sonny Thompson, *Community at Large: Manu'a*
3. Ephraim Temple, *ASCC*
4. Lucy Jacobs, *DMWR*
5. Mike Reynolds, *National Park Service*
6. Henry Sesepasara, *Commercial Fishing*
7. Lauren Wetzell, *Department of Commerce*
8. Alice Lawrence, *Coral Reef Advisory Group*
9. Fatima Sauafea-Leau, *NOAA PIRO*
10. Kevin Painter, *NOAA OLE*
11. Eric Roberts (Call in), *Coast Guard*
12. Charles Birkeland (Call in), *Research*
13. Lauren Garske, *UC Davis*
14. Kevin Grant, *FBNMS*
15. Veronika Mortenson, *FBNMS*
16. Emily Gaskin, *FBNMS*

Welcome, Dean Hudson

Roll Call

Review of Meeting Minutes from previous meeting

Motion to accept – Dean Hudson

Second – Mike Reynolds

Overview of Superintendent's Report

2010 Accomplishments

- SAC Summit
- SAC Recruitment
- Climate Smart
- Preserve America
- Dive into Education
- Camps and Field Trips
- Kiosks
- Marketplace Mural
- Visitors Bureau
- Biogeographic

- Marine Mammals
- Whale Surveys
- MOU with LBJ for Hyperbaric Chamber
- MOU with NPS
- Expanding staff
- Upgrading facilities
- Vessels

Future Events

- Preserve America
- Kiosk
- 25th Anniversary
- Climate Story
- Climate Summit

Assessing the Role of Scientific Information in Sanctuary Management, *Lauren Garske*

Dissertation:

- Runoff from small rivers in Monterey Bay
- Predict highest risks from pollutants
- Look at how scientific information is used to make management decisions

Science Matters to Society

- Has to be relevant
- Has to be accessible
- Is only one facet of consideration
- Politics, economics, and cultural values also matter

Research Goals:

1. Evaluate the flow of SI through advisory councils
2. Assess how sanctuary managers value and use council recommendations
3. Identify condition under which SI can facilitate collaboration and improve effectiveness of management

Purpose:

1. Improve overall understanding and effectiveness of sanctuary management
2. Potential to highlight advisory council & ONMS as a model system
3. Inform current lack of academic understanding about the role of SI in resource management decisions
4. Offer perspective to scientists seeking to improve their communication of relevant findings to appropriate audiences

Stages:

1. Observational visits

2. Introductory visits and interviews
3. Online Survey

Value to Councils:

- Opportunity to share perspective on issue

Products:

- Preliminary results @ 2011 SAC Summit
- Official report to ONMS & SACs
- Publication as a chapter of dissertation
- Publication in academic journals

legarske@ucdavis.edu

707-537-5640

Council Officer Elections

Working Groups

1. Climate Change – Looking for SAC members to review the climate change impact statement document
2. Management Plan/Action Plan
 - a. Informed by Scoping Document
 - b. Eight Action Plans arranged by topics
 - c. Accomplishments assembled in same order as Action Plans
 - d. Strategies and activities address the issues raised by the SAC, public, and other agencies as well as opportunities that have arisen during the scoping process
 - e. Looking for a working group from the advisory council to review the draft strategies and activities
 - f. Would like SAC Feedback before Christmas Holiday

Fatima: Will each action plan have its own working group?

Kevin: We did not plan on it. The Ocean Literacy action plan came from the working group. That has been guided from the onset. Jon Martinez from UofH worked with local scientists to identify science needs to inform action plans. These should not come as a surprise.

Chuck: I would like to work on Climate Change.

Lucy: It may be more difficult to manage but some people may have more experience and expertise in certain parts.

Dean: I agree with Lucy.

Kevin: I am interested in feedback from the SAC so if you would like to divide it up that would be ok.

Chuck: I am happy to read the whole thing.

Lucy: Maybe you could send out the 8 to the SAC and we can identify which chapters we would like to be involved in.

Henry: Can you give us an update on site selection.

Kevin: All of the sites were either brought up during public scoping, the Jennings family (Swains), or presidential proclamation (Rose). Larsen Bay was part of the preferred alternative in 1986. Both the yellow waters of Tui Manua and large coral heads were brought up during public scoping as special areas worthy of protection. The current alternative is one continuative site that covers both areas rather than breaking it up. Recently held meetings in Aunu'u and Ta'u and in both cases the villages were supportive of what was presented.

Lucy: What is the No-Take research site?

Kevin: There was originally a request to have an area that was complete no-take for purposes of research. It should include all representative habitats. For a number of reasons including logistics the site was not included as a separate unit on the north side of Tutuila. Right now we are looking at an area off of Aunu'u and combining it with the Aunu'u site.

Henry: You said the chiefs are supportive. We hope you have documentation of that. The Manu'a chiefs are not happy about Rose Atoll.

Kevin: The Ta'u meeting did not discuss Rose Atoll.

Mike: National Park waters cover Tai Samasama and so a portion of the sanctuary would be overlapping with NPS. That would create management challenges to co-manage with NPS, DMWR, and the village. My opinion is that it would be better to draw the boundary at the national park water but not include that section to avoid the dual management. It does not appear we have the authority to withdraw those waters from the park. [Distributes map]. The blue portions are incorporated to the national park and tai samasama is represented by the star.

Henry: I can see how that could create problems.

Kevin: What problems do you foresee?

Mike: As remote as that area is and how limited as our resources are it would be difficult. If you look at Rose where everyone has different mandates it adds an unnecessary

administrative challenge. A seamless boundary would keep boundaries from getting in the way.

Sonny: I am from Manu'a and I applied to represent the islands. I am happy about the work that you are doing and I am glad to be working with the group. I know that you had two meetings and you went there and I think the issue is to make sure everyone is aware of it. No one is going to stand in the way of protecting our resources for future generations. Some folks did not like the way the meeting went because they were not aware of it. Some were aware of the meeting but the others would like to understand what is going on as well. Thank you.

Ephraim: As an observer of marine protection I have seen where they overlap and it gets difficult when working with the villages. That has come up even in the SAC meetings. I can see that as an issue if the boundaries overlapped in Ta'u. As Sonny said as long as everyone understands. What is DMWR's role?

Lucy: We don't have any authority but we do try to manage all territorial fisheries and it may be included as a no-take or community based MPA.

Henry: There are a lot of programs to help people with disabilities. When Public Health goes to villages and then Social Services comes, with similar but different programs it confuses the people. I can see how dual management can be challenging when national parks has their own management schemes and NMS comes in people can get confused and upset. If there is funds involved to pay the village they will see it as an opportunity for more money so you have to be concerned.

Dean: It is a remote location and whether NMS becomes involved they can provide resources and promote the site. What is your focus?

Mike: Our focus is on the south side often considered the birth place of Polynesia. We maintain a trail to a spring. Few folks range beyond there. Valley of the corals to Tai Samasama is pretty isolated and access is limited.

Lucy: Is there much fishing? I thought this was sacred.

Mike: From what we understand the fishermen do not extend beyond the point because of distance and reduced population.

Lucy: It would be a lot of fuel.

Mike: Therefore I would think the fish populations are in good shape along that stretch. I agree with Dean that the combined resources could be beneficial – sharing a boat, monitoring, access trails, etc. Having both sites would be mutually beneficial just where there is overlap it would add administrative overhead that really isn't necessary.

Dean: None of this will come out as an official document for several months. But all of the comments are captured.

Lucy: It would be nice to see some action taken on those comments. It makes our attendance at meetings pointless if nothing is done about it.

Dean: We can comment and express our concerns but at the end of the day the decision is made between NPS and NMS with the village making the final decision.

Lucy: As agencies we have a responsibility to not all go into villages separately. Otherwise we all cause confusion because we are separate agencies doing effectively the same thing. You can never speak to the whole village. If you speak to a village council it does not capture the opinions of everyone in the village.

Henry: DMWR is collecting fishing data in these areas. Has NMS had a chance to look at it.

Kevin: We have looked at DMWR data and CRED data.

Lucy: They did not collect fisheries data but they may have other data. Would that be Rod Ehler?

Kevin: He met with Marlowe.

Lucy: So he might have it.

Mike: I would love to get that data.

Dean: Any other comments?

Kevin: We needed to have an update on the process and this seemed as good a place as any to have that conversation.

Kevin: We also need an enforcement working group. ONMS was audited by the inspector general and each site mandated to have an enforcement working group. There are a lot of sanctuaries that already have a working group. Enforcement is an issue that we all share. Enforcement working groups would serve a number of purposes for a lot of people. We will send out e-mails asking for volunteers.

Ephraim: Just to clarify a working group to look over the 8 action plans, a semi-permanent enforcement working group, and climate change. The eighth action plan on evaluation does not really need to be looked at.

Reauthorization Act, Kevin Grant

NMSA is the official legislation and underpins the program. It is the legislation that defines the role of sanctuaries and advisory councils and the work we all do. It was re-authorized for 5 years in 2000 so it has expired. Several things can come out of re-authorization including budget increases for that period. Since 2005 our budget has remained flat. However all of our costs have gone up. An opportunity to reauthorize this act will also provide this body with a great opportunity to ensure that issues relevant to this body are included. Both OCNMS and FBNMS are reliant on and work in partnership with local communities. One of the things highlighted in this letter from the ONMS SAC is that they are not offering blanket endorsement. Instead it is advising NOAA to start the process. Everyone here has an interest in marine resources in American Samoa. This is an opportunity to express that. The management plan we are proposing represents a best case scenario but we will not be able to do everything within our current budget. A reauthorized act will allow us to better implement the management plan.

Fatima: Can it be reauthorized for longer?

Kevin: I believe congress can do so, but can get a definitive answer.

Henry: I think we should go on record that we want the process started and we want to be notified of the language.

Dean: We will work with staff to develop the language.

Ephraim: What has Dr. Lubchenco said about reauthorization? It seems that appropriating money is not a congressional priority.

Kevin: She has not said anything.

Ephraim: What does she do?

Kevin: There was an oil spill. She is working to implement the administrations new ocean action plan and marine spatial planning.

Ephraim: This should be on her radar then.

Henry: We need to be on the radar.

Dean: Should we have everyone sign it?

Kevin: That is up to you. Only the Chair signed the OCNMS letter.

Henry: I think it would hold more weight if every SAC member signed.

Dean: We will draft that and get it around to everyone. Is there any other business we need to discuss?

Dean: Closes meeting.