



## Ecosystem Protections Working Group

### Meeting Minutes

**Date:** 09/27/2011

**Start Time:** 2:00pm

**End Time:** 3:20pm

**Meeting Method:** Go-To Meeting

**Attendance:** Adam Pack (Chair, call lead), Rachel Sprague, Sol Kahoohalahala, Sarah Mesnick, Lisa White (note taker), Micki Ream, Jean Souza, Jonathan Martinez, Sarah Courbis, Joey Lecky, Paul Wong, Elia Herman, Brenda Asuncion, Gordon LaBedz-SAC, Nina Monasevitch-public Kauai

■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■

- Review responses from EPWG to the range of alternatives and discuss (Section III) (20min) (Adam)  
Working group member input on the 3 alternatives was solicited. This is the draft table with Adam, Alex, Eric and Hannah's written comments. Please review the table to make sure that your thoughts are captured accurately (if your comments are included) and note if there are any gaps in the pro/con evaluation (open to everyone on call). If you notice gaps, and are a WG member please submit comments in writing, too.

Status Quo: Pro – No additional pros presented on the call

Status Quo: Con – Need clarification of Alex's comment: which alternative is he not in support of status quo or eco? Likely status quo based on his past comments.

No additional cons presented on the call.

Additional Species Approach: Pro – No additional pros presented on the call.

Additional Species Approach: Con – "Adding species would be duplicative and unnecessary" comment brought up by Eric on a prior call. Sarah and Elia were tasked by Adam with looking for gaps in Federal and State management.

No additional cons presented on the call.

Holistic Ecosystem Approach: Pro – No additional pros presented on the call.

Holistic Ecosystem Approach: Con – No additional cons presented on the call.

Discussion on table and its objectives. One common critique is what would the Sanctuary do beyond what is already being done? The recommendation report will address this proactively.

Gordon noted that semantics are important. We need to all be working from a shared definition; we need to define ecosystem-based. Jack and Adam have drafted introduction to



## Ecosystem Protections Working Group

### Meeting Minutes

the report that defines some key wording. Next agenda item is to review WG comments on this definition.

\*\*Any WG members who have not submitted input please send responses to Sarah M by FRIDAY 9/30/11. Sarah M will email current table after call. Sarah M will compile input and email next week for everyone's review.\*\*

- Review responses from the EPWG to the definition of ecosystem-based management and discuss (Section IVa) (20 min) (Sarah M)  
Definitions drafted by Adam and Jack originally. Eric was the only one to contribute comments.  
Discussion on Section IV.a.i and IV.a.ii: need reference to other fully ecosystem-based sanctuaries define ecosystem-based? Incorporate and reference the specific sanctuary.

Gordon noted that preserve and protect means to establish regulatory framework to prevent humans from doing harm. Need to state it up front, even in the face of opposition. We should not rely on other Sanctuary definitions. The Sanctuary should take a firm stance; the stars are aligned in Hawaii with political backing.

Adam responded that once we have what is going on and what is not going on clearly documented then we will further define what preserve/protect mean. We still need to evaluate the gaps in management before we present new regulations. He prefers a science-based argument rather than political argument.

Jon noted that the Papahānaumokuākea Monument definition is in one of the early road map documents for a starting point for defining EBM.

\*\*WG members asked to email further comments on this section by FRIDAY 9/30/11 to Sarah M.\*\*

- Review responses from the EPWG to the recommendations (Section IVb) (20 min) (Sarah M)  
Just Alex commented on this section to develop document of Fed/State management areas that Elia and Sarah are drafting. No other comments from WG members received prior to call.
  - i. Adam and Jack would like to keep EPWG active if (when) Sanctuary decides to go ecosystem-based.  
Rachel thinks that's a great idea and it would be a selling point for the Sanctuary to bring together traditional and western scientific approach. The Sanctuary is a strong community engager in addition to education and outreach strength. [Rachel will submit written comment to fully capture this thought]  
Adam noted the Sanctuary could be a leader in the community (\*Add as PRO FOR EBM\*)
  - ii. Adam highlighted importance of this recommendation.
  - iii.1. No additional thoughts.
  - iii.2. Could draw on examples for other ecosystem-based Sanctuaries.
  - iv. 1. add implementation "with" and working "together"



## Ecosystem Protections Working Group

### Meeting Minutes

v.1. Education, research, conservation primary roles for Sanctuary currently. There is potential for Sanctuary to serve as community liaison (Rachel's suggestion from i). Based on Jean's work in Kauai, communities tend to be ahead of the game. To I.D. pilot communities there are locations that are started on this. Sanctuary not the leaders on this, but can ask to collaborate in iv. In v.2. include non-governmental agencies/organizations.

Thoughts on what role the Sanctuary might play in moving towards EBM...big criticism that there are a lot of other agencies doing this work...recommendations need to help define the Sanctuary's role in EBM.

**\*\*Please send additional comments to Sarah M. by FRIDAY 9/30/11\*\***

Sarah, Adam, Jack will compile comments received and then re-send to the group for further edits.

- Discuss adding to / finishing spread sheet which compares ecosystem-based protected areas (5 min) (report from Elia and Sarah Courbis)  
Elia recommends WG include this evaluation as a recommendation. To do this fully is beyond scope of WG timeframe, but important review to be continued by staff after WG recommendations are due.

No ecosystem plans at State level except DBEDT Ocean Resources Management Plan (ORMP), they are updating their plan so could collaborate with them on management review. Plan was never implemented, that's a potential role for the Sanctuary. Outreach/education/community engagement will need to be expanded if the Sanctuary goes ecosystem-based. Hundreds, maybe thousands, of statutes that apply to ecosystem management, a full evaluation of State and Federal regulations is overwhelming, but with a specific concern or topic to address look at a certain topic when a management issue is brought up. The Sanctuary needs a list of priority issues and then can assess the management gaps surrounding those issues. Sarah C's list of current management at State is the first step in a long process.

Jack and Adam will review Sarah C's initial list and then share with the rest of the WG.

- Review initial responses from letter to technical experts (5 min) (Sarah M.)  
35 letters, custom written to each expert were mailed out. 2 responses have been received back. Next week anticipate 6-7 more responses. Frank Parrish and Sam Pong were the 2 respondents.  
General themes in the responses so far: EBM often fails because it tries to do everything. Need to look at ecosystem priorities. Need to look at mesophotic corals.

**\*\*Sarah will send email reminder to experts. Sarah is sending a better map of Sanctuary boundaries to all experts.\*\***

- Public comment  
No comments from public.



## Ecosystem Protections Working Group

### *Meeting Minutes*

Gordon commended group that last meeting the group was nowhere, but now group is somewhere. Good work.

#### **ACTION ITEMS:**

-Email comments on all alternatives, ecosystem definition and recommendations to Sarah M by FRIDAY 9/30/11. Sarah M will email documents discussed on today's call.

-Joey Lecky will be note taker for the next call.

**Next meeting:** 10/11/2011 at 2:00pm