



National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council Chairs and Representatives Webinar

Monday, September 26, 2016

WEBINAR PARTICIPANTS IN ATTENDANCE:

- **ONMS Headquarters:** John Armor, Matt Brookhart, Matt Stout, Rebecca Holyoke, and Kate Spidalieri
- **ONMS Field Sites:** Beth Dieveney, Kelly Drinnen, Sarah Fangman, Lilli Ferguson, Allison Ikeda, Karlyn Langjahr, Sean Morton, Mike Murray, Joseph Paulin, Jean Prevo, Shannon Ruseborn, Becky Shortland, and Nathalie Ward
- **Advisory Council Chairs and Representatives:**
 - Dianne Black, Chair, Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council (CINMS AC);
 - George Clyde, Chair, Cordell Bank National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council (CBNMS AC);
 - Clint Moore, Chair, Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council (FGBNMS AC);
 - Rick DeVictor, Chair, Gray's Reef National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council (GRNMS AC);
 - Solomon Pili Kaho'ohalahala, Chair, Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council (HIHWNMS AC);
 - Margaret "P.J." Webb, Chair, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council (MBNMS AC);
 - John Largier, Chair, Greater Farallones National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council (GFNMS AC);
 - Timothy Johns, Chair, Northwestern Hawaiian Islands Coral Reef Ecosystem Reserve Advisory Council (NWHICRER AC);
 - Lee Whitford, Chair, Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council (OCNMS AC);
 - Rich Delaney, Vice Chair, Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council (SBNMS AC); and
 - Carol Shafto, Chair, Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council (TBNMS AC).

Updates from Across the System

John Armor, Acting Director, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries

John Armor, Acting Director, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS) welcomed participants and emphasized the webinar's purpose to review the current draft of the ONMS strategic plan, *Our Vision for America's Treasured Ocean Places: A Five-Year Strategy for the National Marine Sanctuary System*. Mr. Armor offered brief, high-level updates from across the system since, as he acknowledged, advisory council chairs only convene with ONMS headquarters a few times every year.

UPDATES:

- **Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument:** In August, President Obama more than quadrupled Papahānaumokuākea's size, from 139,818 square miles to 582,578 square miles, an area larger than all the national parks combined and bigger than the total land area of the state of Alaska. Using his executive authority under the U.S. Antiquities Act, President Obama extended most of the monument's boundary—and its prohibition of commercial fishing—out to the 200-mile limit of the exclusive economic zone (EEZ), making Papahānaumokuākea larger than any other land or ocean conservation area on Earth.
 - The 582,578 square mile addition expands the National Marine Sanctuary System from approximately 170,000 square miles to more than 600,000 square miles!
 - The monument will continue to be jointly managed by three co-trustees, the Departments of Commerce and Interior and the State of Hawai'i through its Department of Land and Natural Resources; however, President Obama's proclamation added the Office of Hawaiian Affairs as a fourth co-trustee in order to elevate the voice of Native Hawaiians.
 - The process to expand the monument started in January 2015, when a group of seven prominent Native Hawaiians wrote to President Barack Obama asking to expand federal protections around the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands. On June 16, 2016, U.S. Senator Brian Schatz (D-Hawai'i) sent a proposal to expand Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument to President Barack Obama following the tenth anniversary of President George W. Bush's order that established the monument's original boundaries. After a series of public meetings in August and a letter from Hawaiian Governor David Ige that supported the monument's expansion, President Obama issued his final proclamation on August 26, 2016.
- **Monitor National Marine Sanctuary:** ONMS is working to draft alternatives for the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) and proposed regulations based on the comments received during the public scoping process.
- **Flower Gardens Banks National Marine Sanctuary:** ONMS is working through the public comments on the DEIS. The advisory council boundary expansion working group is also reviewing the DEIS alternatives and will provide its advice and recommendations to the full council for its consideration.

- **Mallows Bay—Potomac River and Wisconsin—Lake Michigan:** At both sites proposed for sanctuary designation, ONMS is working with its respective state partners on DEISs, draft management plans, and proposed regulations based on the comments received during the public scoping process.
- **Sanctuary Nomination Process Inventory:** Currently, there are two areas on the inventory—Chumash Heritage off the coast of California and Erie, PA. NOAA has not made a decision about whether to move forward to potentially designate either or both sites. ONMS is aware of several nominations that are in development, but have not been submitted by communities yet.

Mr. Armor drew his session to a close by noting that the monument's expansion in particular is generating a lot of questions ONMS will have to "digest." He further elaborated that it is significant for ONMS to be entrusted with helping to manage the world's largest protected area and that the expansion speaks to the power and impact of communities; therefore, even though ONMS will have to encounter new challenges as it moves forward, announcements like the monument's expansion allow it to reflect on what has been accomplished since the passage of the National Marine Sanctuaries Act in 1972.

Mr. Armor then asked Dianne Black, Chair, Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council to talk about the recently convened Enforcement Discussion Panel.

Enforcement Discussion Panel

[Dianne Black, Chair, Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council](#)

Dianne Black, Chair, Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary (CINMS) Advisory Council introduced the purpose, objectives, and members of the advisory council Enforcement Discussion Panel (EDP). Ms. Black began by announcing that the panel's first meeting had occurred on Friday, September 24 and Rich Delaney, Vice Chair, SBNMS AC also participated. In addition to Ms. Black and Mr. Delaney, the five-member panel also includes Richard Charter, GFNMS AC; Rick Gaffney, HIHWNMS AC and NWHICRER AC; and Bruce Popham, FKNMS AC. Ms. Black noted that members were selected based on recommendations from ONMS regional directors and superintendents. Moreover, Ms. Black said that, after being asked to chair the panel by ONMS headquarters, she sought the approval of her own council before accepting the position.

Ms. Black then elaborated on the first meeting's outcomes. The panel chose to wait until after it heard from enforcement experts before it decides on the final form of any recommendations and who from the system's councils will be asked to review them (e.g., just the panel members, all chairs, all councils, etc.); however, the panel's ultimate task will be to write a letter to the NOAA Administrator that highlights ONMS's enforcement needs and priorities from a community perspective. Accordingly, in only two or three more meetings, the panel requested that it would like to learn more about: how enforcement is funded; the state of enforcement technologies (possibly from an NGO, like SkyTruth); and state partnerships and joint enforcement agreements (JEAs). In particular, Ms. Black shared that the panel would like to hear from NOAA's Director of Law Enforcement, Jim Landon, who also presented at the 2016 National Marine Sanctuaries Advisory Council Summit. Specifically, the panel is interested in coordinating its next meeting with Mr. Landon's schedule in order to obtain some level of confidence that he is interested in listening to communities and improving enforcement in sanctuaries.

Ms. Black then opened the floor for comments from ONMS and her advisory council colleagues on the question of who may want to review the panel's final recommendations, in particular.

ONMS: We have informed Jim that this panel has been assembled and he is interested in hearing from the respective members. We are currently working with his chief of staff to setup a time for Jim to meet with the panel.

ONMS: Dianne, have you considered bringing in state presenters because state governments are an essential part of how the enforcement world works and could provide an important parallel to contribute to the discussion?

Chair, CINMS AC: I think that we are definitely open to hearing from a state expert. Rich, is there anything else you want to add?

Vice Chair, SBNMS AC: Good summary, Dianne. I just want to emphasize the new opportunity we have with Jim Landon's recent appointment and attendance at the summit. Furthermore, we have a chance to build on this internal momentum with OLE with the strategic plan's upcoming release and several non-governmental organizations (NGOs) meetings this year as well.

Chair, MBNMS AC: Enforcement is definitely a priority for MBNMS. I would like there to be more mitigation measures for environmental effects, like whale acoustics. I fully support going forward with this panel.

Chair, NWHICRER AC: Rick is already supporting us, so we would be fully supportive of an outcome, especially with the impending change in the administration.

Chair, OCNMS AC: I would love to represent our advisory council in a letter.

Chair, HIHWNMS AC: Rick is representing us. In our last attempt to look at ecosystem-based management, enforcement was a point of contention with the state and any clarifying information on that subject would be very beneficial.

ONMS: I concur with the panel's recommendation regarding timing the letter such that it coordinates with the appointment of the new NOAA Administrator. In the transition between Dr. Sullivan and her successor, the highest ranked career employee is Benjamin Friedman, Deputy Under Secretary for Operations. Mr. Friedman was formerly the Deputy General Counsel for NOAA and the head of the Office of General Counsel's Enforcement Section and is supportive of sanctuaries. He can help brief the new NOAA Administrator and something vetted and presented by each council could be huge. Based on past experiences, the transition could be as early as February and as late as June.

Chair, FGBNMS AC: One size does not fit all; have you done a sanctuary site-by-site threat analysis?

Chair, CINMS AC: No and I do not think we will; we are not getting that specific. We will have a general system letter and maybe append regional or site priorities because we do not have unlimited time and resources.

Vice Chair, SBNMS AC: The other opportunity that I heard at the Our Oceans conference, in addition to the new NOAA Administrator, is the increased use of scientific advancements and technology. We should try to triangulate that point at which ONMS, science/technology, and OLE all intersect.

ONMS: Great point. I think we talked about this at the summit in January. I met with the new Chief of the Office of General Counsel's Enforcement Section, John Han. Although John does not have a natural resources background, he was a criminal prosecutor in D.C. In this new position, John seems to be interested in the use of new technologies which he previously utilized in criminal law.

Reviewing the Strategic Plan

Rebecca Holyoke, Strategic Planning Coordinator, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries

Rebecca Holyoke, Strategic Planning Coordinator, ONMS kicked off this opportunity for the webinar's participants to comment on and ask questions about the current draft of the ONMS's strategic plan with a brief introduction on its evolution to this point. From the outset, Dr. Holyoke emphasized that ONMS wanted to make this five-year iteration of a strategic plan different than its ten-year predecessor that was lengthy, verbose, and not user-friendly; conversely, this new plan should be more accessible, not overly bureaucratic, and forward thinking. Accordingly, ONMS assembled a ten-person core team, with representatives from ONMS headquarters and field sites, to address the task ahead. Since December 2015, the core team has worked to produce the version in front of participants today. Over the course of almost one year, Dr. Holyoke noted that the core team evaluated a variety of public and private sector strategic plans in order to learn from other types of entities or institutions, in addition to government.

Dr. Holyoke then discussed a few of the plan's specific components that related to this session's discussion. First, she said that ONMS chose a five-year time span for this plan in order to setup up the program for its 50th anniversary in 2022; regardless, the plan's mission and vision statements will extend beyond that five-year period and provide ONMS with a longstanding direction. Second, she relayed that, internally, ONMS is currently working on identifying and then selecting the key priorities that will appear in the plan and guide the program over the next five years; therefore, key priorities were not included in the current version. Finally, queuing participants for their feedback, Ms. Holyoke concluded with a set of questions to focus the session's outcomes (e.g., Is ONMS on the right track? Are the goals and objectives in the right order? Do you agree with calling out our highest priorities? Are there major holes or gaps in this plan you would like to see addressed?).

Chair, GFNMS AC: I do not have any burning issues so I am happy to chime in later.

Chair, OCNMS AC: At OCNMS, we are facing rapid environmental changes; therefore, I would like to see something about monitoring these changes because we have to know what is going on, right now, in real time so we know how to reduce human impacts and promote resilience.

ONMS: We can take a look at goal four and see how it relates to goal one.

Chair, MBNMS AC: At MBNMS, we have a lot of data, but not enough data analysis.

Chair, OCNMS AC: That statement would also hold true for OCNMS.

Chair, GFNMS: To what extent do you balance protecting the resources you already have against protecting more, especially in light of budgetary constraints? We want to do more than put a name or status on a part of the ocean.

Chair, MBNMS AC: I love the news about the PMNM expansion, but when you hear the new size of the National Marine Sanctuary System, I struggle with the increase and the question of whether there will be funding to accompany it. For instance, will we have an increased number of visitors and thus, use of the monument that will necessitate more enforcement?

Chair, CBNMS AC: Funding is a key aspect and I understand that the plan may not have something about Congress, but you should look to include additional sources of revenue under goal three because I do not see that there

currently. For example, I am aware that some national foundations are supporting government programs no longer funded by Congress; therefore, we need to consider more than just government grants.

ONMS: I appreciate that comment. I just wanted to let you know that we have thought about that at great length in drafting this plan. Objective 3.3 is designed to be about what you are discussing.

ONMS: Under “Key Initiatives,” you will see the fifth one is to “enhance external support.” In the coming months, the National Marine Sanctuary Foundation (NMSF) will have a new president and chief executive officer (CEO) and there is already a keen awareness of the desire for NMSF to seek new revenue sources in addition to government grants.

Chair, CINMS AC: Maybe put goal three before goal two because goal two is all about expanding the system and it might be better to have the goal about finance first. I also think that goal five is very critical and should be higher; you need to create measurable objectives, but do not set benchmarks you cannot achieve.

Vice Chair, SBNMS AC: In the last section, “Operationalizing Our Plan” you reference the budget. If you put the key priorities in that section, and match it with a projected budget request, the former will likely exceed the latter; regardless, that could be an idea for demonstrating where we want to go and how much it will cost.

Chair, MBNMS AC: I agree with Rich and think that it will help justify the system’s expansion.

Vice Chair, SBNMS AC: The plan could be a firm document for non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to refer to when lobbying Congress.

Chair, GFNMS AC: I think the document can be used in a variety of ways over the next five years. It is great that goal one is number one. I would like to know what goal one will mean for each sanctuary.

Chair, NWHICRER AC: In regards to operationalizing the plan, is there a communications strategy about how ONMS intends to use the plan and who in fact will or should use the plan? Right now, it is focused internally, although it will eventually need to be pushed out to the nation.

Chair, MBNMS AC: I do not think the plan/we talk enough about cultural resources and heritage even though both are very important.

Chair, NWHICRER AC: Having recently attending the World Conservation Congress, I would underscore that point. The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) is looking more and more at cultural resources and, for instance, how cultural resources can inform science.

Chair, FGBNMS AC: I have been through several organizations’ strategic planning processes; the struggle is to capture the view from both 40,000 feet and on the ground. As I asked at the 2016 National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council Summit, how can we make our program go from a “nice to have” to a “got to have” and I think the plan does a nice job of that at the 40,000-foot view. I recently traveled to both Glacier National Park and FGBNMS each for a week, where the latter requires considerably more effort to visit. I think it is important, like with national parks, to bring more people to sanctuaries or show them what our special places offer. I have no issue with the order of the goals; however, I would suggest that you move objective 1.3 to 1.1. We must remember that we want to “create the love” and think about how we can use this document for budget requests.

Chair, TBNMS AC: I write strategic plans and I think it looks good. There may be more to talk about when it gets down to the next level because it will be difficult to get to that level and then obtain more funding.

ONMS: The most difficult part of the “flight” is taking off and landing. We are meeting with a lot of people in our program to get the level of details correct.

Chair, TBNMS AC: My concern is that when we make things too broad and too general they are difficult to meet; however, I think that even without the key priorities, the plan is a good place to start.

ONMS: I think next time you see the plan it will have greater specificity; however, since this plan will also serve as a communications and marketing tool, we cannot be too specific.

Chair, GRNMS AC: My comments are along the line that you are on the right track; however, it is hard to comment without the key priorities and that is where you are going to get a lot more feedback. Objective 3.1 needs to cultivate relationships; we want to promote public engagement, but in a sustainable way. Will councils be able to comment on the plan?

ONMS: We have discussed this internally and looked at what other NOAA offices have done. Typically, NOAA does not share its strategic plans with the public; however, we might post it on our website for a thirty-day comment period once the key priorities are situated because the alternative of waiting for every council to weigh in on the plan would take too long and delay its finalization and release.

Chair, GRNMS AC: I agree that that would balance the ability for public input and efficient release of the plan.

Chair, FGBNMS AC: I would like to see a statement in the plan about transparency and openness and the ability for stakeholders to be more involved in different processes. For example, there was a fifteen-month DEIS process to produce a draft environmental impact statement for the proposed FGBNMS expansion alternatives where advisory council members could not be involved in certain staff discussions.

ONMS: Did you read through the core values section of the document?

Chair, FGBNMS AC: Yes, I did.

ONMS: The idea of transparency shows up as a higher-level core value that draws attention to not just what we do, but who we are as a program; therefore, I would ask you to look at the core value for “accountability.” Moreover, I view the core values at a higher level than the goals because they permeate everything we do; however, if there is something more than that that we can do, we could certainly entertain thoughts.

Chair, FGBNMS AC: Let me think about it and I will let you know.

Chair, MBNMS AC: One of the things I have noticed from my short time in the sanctuary program is a lack of public participation; we should increase public participation in order to enhance even a basic understanding of ONMS and the system among people, especially to make sure that ONMS is not conflated with other parts of NOAA, like the National Marine Fisheries Service.

ONMS: Just to clarify, we have already done a lot of work to gather key priorities and now we have to winnow them down, in lieu of actually creating or coming up with key priorities, so I see that as a good thing; therefore, we were not

at a point to release them yet in this draft. Regardless, I wanted to let you know what you can expect to see and how that will address concerns about the plan's level of detail.

Vice Chair, SBNMS AC: At Stellwagen, we have seen sharp increases in ocean temperature (as cited recently in a study by the Gulf of Maine Research Institute). We cannot avoid the climate change issue and need to be talking about it; I look forward to seeing it in the strategic plan as it becomes final because I am supportive of a more affirmative statement about climate change.

Chair, OCNMS AC: I agree and would also be supportive of increasing support for sanctuaries.

Chair, FGBNMS AC: Do not forget to emphasize research in general because we are performing a lot of great marine science and I want to keep people of all partisan beliefs supportive of sanctuaries.

Vice Chair, SBNMS AC: We have science at which both sides of the line can look.

Chair, FGBNMS AC: I just want to make sure that funding does not support climate change to the exclusion of our science programs more broadly.

Chair, HIHWNMS AC: I want to support what was said earlier. Internationally, there is a need for us to be more proactive in resource protection in that we are not only going to have to maintain the current state of our sanctuaries, but also be able to contend with forthcoming impacts.

ONMS: Rebecca Holyoke is the staff point on the strategic plan so feel free to contact her with any comments or feedback.

Concluding Remarks

ONMS: I want to underscore the amount of hard work that the core team has put into the plan, and specifically, recognize the team for what is truly a "Herculean effort." Back to Clint's earlier metaphor, we are getting ready to prepare for a landing and will continue to need your input as we put the wheels down.

Chair, FGBNMS AC: Overall, I appreciate having a webinar approximately every six months, whether we share general site updates or focus on a specific topic like today.

ONMS: I agree. We are starting to think about our next in-person meeting tentatively in late summer or early fall 2017 (between August and October); however, we will have another webinar before then in spring 2017 that could generate topics for our next in-person meeting. In the meantime, please continue to reach out to ONMS staff on an individual level. You can even visit your fellow advisory council colleagues while on travel.

On an unrelated, but pertinent note, at a Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council meeting, I previously committed to convening recreational fishing members from across the system. I think that recreational fishermen should be some of our biggest supporters but, at this point in time, they are not always. One way I hope to find answers is through a proposed summit on December 14-15, 2016 in Fort Lauderdale, Florida. Invitations to select, but not all, advisory council recreational fishing representatives will be forthcoming. Certainly, we have to acknowledge that we are not going to agree on every subject relevant to both parties, and that is alright, but the focus

of the meeting will evaluate those areas on which we can reach a consensus. The summit will be put on in collaboration with the National Marine Fisheries Service and National Marine Sanctuary Foundation.

Chair, CINMS AC: When will invitations be sent out?

ONMS: They will be sent out in the next few weeks; at that time, we will CC the chairs of each council.

ONMS: Thank you for sharing your thoughts today and we look forward to the next webinar in the spring.