Meeting Notes

‘Āhihi-Kīna‘u Natural Area Reserve Advisory Group’s
Working group for a 5 Year Reserve Management Plan

J. Walter Cameron Center Auditorium
95 Mahalani Street, Wailuku, Maui

Purpose: A workshop of agency, advisory group, and community participants convened over three days to develop a foundation for a management plan for the ‘Āhihi-Kīna‘u Natural Area Reserve. The products of this work group will be folded into a management plan which will be available for public comment at three separate meetings in 2009: ‘Āhihi-Kīna‘u NAR / Keone‘ō‘io NAR Advisory Group, Natural Area Reserve System Commission, Board of Land and Natural Resources.

These notes cover the first two days of the workshop, November 12-13, 2008.

Workshop Day 1 - November 12, 2008	8:30 am - 4:30 pm	Where are we now?
Workshop Day 2 – November 13, 2008	8:30 am - 4:30 pm	Where are we going?

Meeting notes for Wednesday November 12, 2008: Where are we now?

In attendance: Aimoku Pali, Ann Fielding, Betsy Gagne, Bill Evanson, Charles Maxwell Sr., Hannah Bernard, John Cumming, Ken Kawahara, Kuhea Paracuellas, Mark White, Matt Ramsey, MiQe Klemme, Mona Kapaku, Lehua Pali, Randy Kennedy, Russell Sparks, Meghan Dailer

Facilitation team: Emily Fielding, Jason Sumiye, Manuel Mejia, Marion Ano, Russell Amimoto (The Nature Conservancy Hawaii)

Notes compiled by: Emily Fielding

9:00 am - Welcome, purpose, agenda overview, introductions and expectations
On the first workshop day, we focused on discussing and understanding the current status and context of the reserve. The *objectives* for Day 1 were:

1. Launch the working group, clarify roles and expectations
2. Confirm and refine conservation targets and threats
3. Develop a common understanding of the current situation

Handouts

1. Three day agenda and objectives
2. NARS Vision and Mission Statement
3. Conservation targets and nested resources
4. 10 Step Conservation Action Planning Process
5. Target viability (summary)
6. Target viability (detailed)

7. Threat ranking (detailed)
8. Situational Analysis Small working groups
9. Glossary
10. Participant evaluation Days 1-2

Agenda

Day 1	**Wednesday Nov. 12**
8:30	Registration, coffee/tea
9:00	Welcome, purpose, and agenda overview, and introductions
10:00	Overview of ʻAhihi-Kīnaʻu Natural Area Reserve, past planning efforts, current planning framework
10:30	Break
10:45	Review and discussion of targets and threats
12:00	Lunch (provided)
1:00	Threat ranking and Current situation and stakeholder analysis
2:30	Break
2:45	Current situation and stakeholder analysis, continued
3:45	Next steps, evaluation, wrap up
4:00	Ua pau

The first hour of the meeting was devoted to an explanation of the process and purpose of the workshop and a round of self introductions by the participants and facilitators. Each participant was asked to state their connection to the Ahihi-Kinau area, and their expectations for the three day workshop.

Expectations

- Collaboration-all messages on same page combine knowledge and wisdom for protection
- Move to a more formal management process, bring in the greater community, more community input, enhance linkages between agency and community-open channel of communication
- Provide for use/protection-challenge plan to guide us-controls, monitoring management plans will change.
- Best possible plan. Process to keep focused
- Cohesiveness
- Plan to last for the future
- Plan to protect fishing rights and preserve
- Know the place-go see it
- Take information to utilize
- Provide learning opportunities
- Progress
- Identify people/groups who will take care of this place
- Plan is arrived at
- Getting to know this place, result in management plan thru this process, set a new standard for responsible tourism and management

- Management plan to protect resources
- Implement a management plan, have people of Maui behind it.
- Listen, learn, do no repeat the past, listen to different stakeholders, listen to people, land, and water
- Group drives directions of site, unified influence department/legislature

Ground rules were established.

- Participate
- Don't dominate
- Tough love
- Boss-free zone
- Everyone advocates; group decides
- Cell phones off
- No side conversations
- Have fun

10:00 am - Overview of NAR
Matt Ramsey gave a 10 minute power point explaining the purpose and function of the Natural Area Reserve System in protecting the biodiversity of Hawaiian ecosystems and the unique qualities of ʻĀhihi-Kīnaʻu NAR.

Bill Evanson gave a 10 minute description of past planning efforts for the NAR. (See also http://hawaii.gov/dlnr/dofaw/nars/reserves/maui/ahihikinau for a compilation of past events concerning the NAR, under literature)

- 1973 - NAR established by Governor's Executive Order
- 1977 – Makena / La Perouse State Park Plan
- 1992 – Draft management plan for the NAR based on 1988 resource assessment
- 1998 – DLNR Hotspot/Sustainability Campaign
- 2004-2007 – Draft planning process between staff and advisory group to address human use issues
- 2008 – 2 year Resource Protection Plan
- (In addition, many resource assessments have been done over the years)

Emily Fielding gave a 10 minute explanation of the current planning effort and frame work in which The Nature Conservancy has partnered with NAR staff to complete a management plan utilizing the Conservation Action Planning method.

2007 – Compiled existing information, previous staff and advisory group work

2008 – Formatted using Conservation Action Planning (CAP) Framework
The 10 steps of the CAP process are:
1. Identify people involved
2. Set project scope and conservation targets
3. Assess viability of targets

4. Identify critical threats
5. Analyze current situation
6. Develop objectives, strategies, and action steps
7. Develop measures
8. Develop work plans
9. Implement
10. Analyze, learn, adapt, share

Throughout the discussion thoughts by participants were recorded in the "boat harbor" a place to hold thoughts that we may want to address later

Boat Harbor

- Good to have a chronology of all NAR events/minutes; permits and reports
- Email work group members: 1) Past planning efforts 2)Relevant documents (plans)
- Alignment of various agencies expectations with working group
- Capacity/situation
- Long term funding for road
- Reach out to other native Hawaiian organizations and groups to get input during visioning process (John Tomoso)
- How can preservation and education co-exist
- What are we reserving it for?

10:45 am - Review and discussion of targets and threats

This activity was designed to familiarize participants with the 7 conservation targets. After reviewing the summary in formation arranged in posters on the wall, participants commented on the target summary information, and the viability and threat rankings. Viability and threat rankings were based on the following criteria – participants were asked to give "gut-level" check on the analysis.

Viability Range

- Very Good-Ecologically desirable status; requires little intervention for maintenance
- Good-Indicator within acceptable range of variation; some intervention required for maintenance
- Fair-Outside acceptable range of variation; requires human intervention
- Poor-Restoration increasingly difficult; may result in extirpation of target

Threat Rating Criteria

- Severity-level of damage to target that can be expected within 10 years
- Scope-geographic scope of impact on target that can be expected within 10 years
- Irreversibility-the degree to which the effects of a direct threat can be stored
- Contribution-the expected contribution of the source, acting alone, to the full expression of a stress

Summary of comments on posters

Wilderness Qualities

- Use the word intrinsic instead of existence
- Add category for spiritual renewal, spiritual regenerative value
- For threat, replace potential development with proposed development; and lights at night will be high if development approved, so will people and cars increase to high
- Regarding the public road- any and as many cars enter non-stop, the visual impact of so many people standing, entering all over shallow marine, cultural and geologic resources
- Need for open landscape: Hawaii cultural nuances that one gets from this area; ʻĀhihi-Kīnaʻu represents the travels of Pele as she came from Kahoolawe towards Haleakala. For Native Hawaiians looking about this vista is Pele's travels – strong Hawaiian cultural significance.

Native Hawaiian Cultural and Historic Sites

- Regarding resource health assessment "cultural and historic sites intact" Good? I understand the graves have been desecrated and some trails go right through archeological sites. I'd give it a fair rating. How did we get from good to fair?
- ʻĀhihi-Kīnaʻu represents the footprints of my ancestors and the remnants which in modern times represents our cultural past
- Add a threat: Impacts from ungulates trampling sites
- Threats: should all be high
- "Presence of people lacking awareness" should be high
- Presence of large numbers of people who lack awareness should be high not medium. If they had more awareness the may not be engaging in the detrimental activities that are ranked as high

Anchialine pools

- "Potential" for human trampling in pools is very high, I think
- To rank accurately on predation on water birds by small mammals, it would be important to know what the population once was, as well as what it is now
- These ponds were sacred to the Hawaiians that only the royalty could enter or eat anything from the ponds; because any human intervention would kill anything in the ponds.

Leeward Shrub lands and Forests

- Keep succession as "natural" as possible – native plants may not appear diverse, but a 500 year old flow on the dry side of the island has its own challenge to keep weeds under control as native species re-colonize; need to include fire.
- Add fire as a threat; it is a risk
- Status of wiliwili is very poor

- The la'au that is found in this area signifies the different la'au lapa'au (medicinal herbs) that were used for healing and self advancement; each plant that is grown represents the ancient gods
- Medium rating for the transport of weed species may be too conservative if you look at potential new introductions. Maybe should be listed as high.

Lava flows, formations, and habitats

- Lava flow and formations don't seem to be in fair health, I would say good
- Perhaps potential threat of alien vegetation (i.e. fountain grass) should be listed. Fountain grass is known to rapidly establish itself as a dominant species on new lava flows on Hawaii Island
- Add dogs – wild dogs chasing goat herds in Kanaio
- How would another flow affect the NAR?
- Level of threat from mammalian predators is unknown. Fern Duvall thinks that this threat keeps birds from moving into the area
- Spray paint limited to two trails; thus scope is small
- Lava flow - from a native Hawaiian perspective, one of the most important aspects of ancient culture. Goes back to creation chant – how Pele created these islands Pu'u created by Pele. Receptacle for ancient civilization. Honoring the place by burying the dead.

Fringing Coral Reef and Endemic and Unique Marine Habitats

- Montipora tidepool should be "fair"
- Montipora health – dependant on area, not good or fair in Mokuhā due to human impact
- Coral recruitment should be considered a health measure because it will decrease with the increase of threats such as sedimentation and algal cover
- Should be "Low" invasive and alien species composition
- Shoreline access (high); tidepools (fair); marine debris (medium) every two months; harassing turtles, dolphis (medium); coral recruitment
- Bnthic community structure very good in some areas (CRAMP study)
- Run-off – Cattle? More development impacts add to subterranean water
- Potential for poaching is high if there is no presence in the area
- Matt says marine debris is more than low
- How would the threat of non-motorized, non-commercial vessels (kayaks) be rated in fishpond areas that are considered navigable waters when the sea level is high, covering fishpond walls
- Land-based pollution should be very high due to proposed development
- Potential expansion of existing alien algae should be very high due to proposed development
- Crown of thorns may be good; may be part of natural system and important to overall coral reef health and diversity
- Endemic habitat – the fish, shrimp for us represent different legends. The opae ula is one of Pele's kinolau. Different kinds of fish were sustenance for our people
- The ocean was the ancient highway for canoe travelers

- Global warming not low – bottom four should be medium, except boat anchoring
- Access to surrounding areas – is it a threat, and is it an advantage to acquire the private lands within the NAR?
- Coral for Hawaiian was the representative of the land and the aina because it was the direct product of the land; and so coral represented this aspect it was used for ceremonial purposes in ancient times

1:00 pm – Threat Ranking and Current situation and stakeholder analysis

Top ranked threats
(Group 1)
Too many people and cars / lacking awareness (16)
Foot traffic and trampling (11)

(Group 2)
Impacts of proposed regional development and population increase resulting in land-based pollution, nutrients and structures (6)
Existing coastal development and construction and associated land-based pollution into the ocean / Lights at night that could disorient wildlife and humans (8)

(Group 3)
Native Hawaiian and regional culture not preserved or shared (9)
Destruction of formations, rock removal, vandalism to lava and lava tube caves, reconstruction of archeological features (6)

Feral ungulates (6)
Poaching of marine species (6)

Human waste and trash in anchialine pools and archeological sites (3)
Potential introduction of aquatic alien species by people (2)
Global warming, sea temperature rise, coral bleaching, ocean acidification (1)
Predation on native plant seeds, nesting water birds by mammals (1)
Coral disease (1)

Motorized vessel entry
Vessel anchoring
Crown of thorn starfish
Air and boat traffic
Marine debris washing up on reefs or shores, entangling marine life
Harassing protected species
Alien marine fish species (existing)
Introduced woody species growing around anchialine pools and archeological features
Transport of weed species across lava flows
Competition with introduced plant species

Three groups were formed around the top three threat rankings. Each group conducted an analysis of the current situation – illustrating the links between the resources, threats, causal factors, and stakeholders. The three charts are attached. Below is the summary of the text:

Situation analysis**:** Group 1
Target (green)
All NAR resource values

Threats (orange)
- Existing coastal development and construction and associated land-based pollution into the ocean (8)
- Lights at night that could disorient wildlife and humans (8)
- Impacts of proposed and future regional development and population increase resulting in land-based pollution, excess nutrients and structures (6)

Contributing factors (yellow)
Light pollution
Increased sedimentation on reef
Increased nutrients in all water sources
Roads
Redirecting natural waterways (streams, gullies, underground natural drainage)
Sewage (cesspools, septic systems and leach fields, injection wells)
Runoff (construction sites, paved surfaces)
Landscaping fertilizers (yards, golf courses)
Inappropriate development near the reserve (housing, roads, resorts, lighting)
Zoning and permitting
Inappropriate zoning
Lack of enforcement of grading and lighting ordinances

People involved (pink)
State and county agencies
Landowners
Developers
Speculators
Visitors to new tourist accommodations
Locals

Situation analysis: Group 2
Target
All NAR resource values

Threats
- Destruction of formations, rock removal, vandalism to lava and lava tube caves, reconstruction of archeological features (6)
- Native Hawaiian and regional culture and history not preserved or shared (9)

Contributing factors (yellow)
Lack of established trail system
Laws not enforced
Not enough hands to keep clean
Lack of support, staff, expertise, funding for interpretation, protection
Lack of inventory of archeological sites (burial sites protected)
Lack of knowledge of cultural remnants, and culture itself
Lack of guidelines for proper conduct around archeological sites
**
Loss of hope, hectic lifestyle, not clear kuleana
Loss of continuity of cultural values
Loss of links to past, transfer of knowledge
Culture suppressed –don't speak Hawaiian
Hawaiians can't do everything – must address larger political issues
Degradation of Hawaiian social systems and lands
Hawaii becoming like the mainland

People involved (pink)
State office of historic preservation
DOCARE
Native Hawaiian Chamber of Commerce
Maui/Lanai Island Burial Council
Agencies and partners
**
Visitors (tourists)
New residents
Locals
School age children, charter schools especially

Situation analysis: Group 3
Target
All NAR resource values

Threats
Too many people and cars lacking awareness (16)
Foot traffic and trampling (11)

Contributing factors (yellow)
Lack of infrastructure and facilities
Insufficient signage
Lack of authority over the road
In sufficient number of enforcement officers and other on site presence
Lack of strategic communications plan
Over exposure through media

Commercial use
Tourist industry information – promotes site with out good info
Insufficient awareness of rules
High demand, low supply of alternate recreation locations
Vicinity to heavily populated area
Lack of recreational, comprehensive planning that includes la perouse
Easy access
Abundance of marine resources
Lack of visitor regime management

People involved (pink)
Media
Authors / travel writers
Visitors
Local businesses (marine recreation outfitters)
Cultural practitioners
NGOs/community organizations
Hotels, TVRs, HTA, HVB, MVB
Gov't agencies (state DLNR – DAR, DOFAW, DOCARE)
Residents of the NAR
Native Hawaiians
Locals

3:30 pm – Wrap-up and Evaluation

Day 1 evaluation

Positive aspects of the workshop	**Things that could change**
Utilization of wall space	Shorten lunch hour
Visual aids	Overwhelming at first glance
Presentation	Bring own coffee mug
Voting	Tour Ahihi Kinau before coming
Food	Lacking some people
Facilitation, ground rules	
Breaks-use of time	
Linkage exercise-revealed new things	
Chance to share ideas, feedback	
Can appreciate site more with new information	
Different facilitators	
Good # of people not too small or big	
Broad range of expertise in room	
Trusting the process, did not push agenda	

Meeting notes for Thursday, November 13, 2008: Where are we going?

In attendance: Ann Fielding, Art Medeiros, Betsy Gagne, Bill Evanson, Charles Maxwell, Cheryl King, Hannah Bernard, John Cumming, Ken Kawahara, Kuhea paracuelaas, Mark White, Matt Ramsey, Miqe Klemme, Mona Kapaku, Nicole Davis, Randy Kennedy Russell Sparks, Robert Luuwai, Meghan Dailer, Aimoku Pali, Lehua Pali

Facilitation team: Emily Fielding, Jason Sumiye, Manuel Mejia, Marion Ano, Russell Sparks (The Nature Conservancy Hawaii)

Day 2	**Thursday Nov. 13**
8:30	Registration, coffee/tea
9:00	Welcome, agenda overview
9:15	Vision development
10:30	Break
10:45	Capacity assessment
12:00	Lunch
1:00	Objective and strategy overview
2:15	Break
2:30	Objective and strategy development (small groups)
3:15	Break
3:30	Discuss Objectives and strategies
3:45	Next steps, evaluation, wrap up, Public comment
4:00	Ua Pau

9:00 am Welcome, Day 1 and Agenda Overview
Day two focused on the future direction of the reserve. The *objectives* were:

1. Develop a common vision
2. Develop three priority goals
3. Develop an initial set of objectives and strategies

9:30 Vision Development
The group broke up in pairs to interview each other about the positive core of the NAR and what their preferred future looks like. When the group resumed, each person reported out to the larger group what they had learned from each other. The different components of their vision were posted on the wall, and categorized into groupings of similar thoughts. Below are the instructions given the group about what a "vision" is, and the categorized notes to be used to construct a common vision. At lunch, a small group of volunteers came together to craft a vision statement to present to the larger group.

Draft vision statement:
Through *kokua* and *malama* of the Hawaiian culture at Ahihi-Kinau NAR, the natural resources are respected, protected and shared in perpetuity. *Ua mau ke ea o ka aina i ka pono.*

Vision = Preferred future

- Your vision statement should:
- Describe what you want in the future
- Not assume the world will be the same as today
- Be written in the present tense, as if the future were today
- Be specific to your site
- Reflect your groups' beliefs and values
- Be positive and inspiring
- Be idealistic, yet realistic

Visioning exercise categorized comments
Limits

- Enforcement is limiting access which means desirability. It is still a sanctuary for nature, people, viewscapes, silence, open space
- Road closed at dumps; open only to local traffic and fishermen; guided tours staying on designated trails; naturalist educate about area resources; teach overall respect.
- Rugged road in the NAR to signify this is a rugged place
- Huge sign arching over the road to identify the NAR
- Less people because it's a reserve; interpreters talking to people; limited numbers of people
- Closed area stays closed forever; fences and monitoring programs to establish health and status of all resources, i.e., anchialine pools, marine, natural and cultural resources.
- There are few people around, but not hundreds. These people have an appreciation of natural resources and are continuing to learn.
- Caves off limits
- Allow access, but limit numbers
- 2013 More limited number of visitors to the reserve; more controlled, designated trails.
- Small number of visitors
- Carrying capacity initiated; every user is educated and informed before using the reserve (like Hanauma Bay).
- Limit capacity perhaps using a reservation system.

Sustainable/appropriate use (limited)

- Cultural community involved in protection and management of the area
- All reserve users will be exhibiting proper etiquette and behavior
- Majority of reserve preserved, with some use allowed
- Surfing permitted in Ahihi Bay

- 2 trails: Fish bowl; ʻĀhihi bay; only guided hikes to fishbowl
- No further development
- No commercial activity
- Improved trails/boardwalk that people would stay on
- Aquire lands adjacent for camping and other activities (like Waianapanapa); want to be a thriving place with activities for sustainable use
- Utilize low impact and sustainable measures

Education

- Education station with displays about the NAR at the dumps parking area
- Living classroom by the fishpond; restored fishpond
- Protect and show in a responsible way
- At ocean: placard and /or person teaches how to behave; teaches about fish and why there are so many (protected); more rangers throughout the area.
- Educational opportunities upon entry
- Serves as a model for other places around Maui; controlled and purposeful entry; place for learning and giving back to area; enforcement is consistent and effective
- Ranger greets you at the entrance with a pamphlet; pamphlet contents: about the place, sense of place; map that shows where facilities are located, trails are, cultural sites are (if allowed), information about how Hawaiians lived; placard that invokes a sense of awe that Hawaiians lived successfully here.
- Kiosk
- Designated trails and snorkel sites
- Guides to interpret unique features
- Visitors to the NAR are informed and educated with an attitude of respect and privilege rather than of entitlement
- Professional and in depth scientific and cultural interpretation

Culture and community engagement

- Hawaiian community is an integrated part of the NAR; kupuna and youth out at fish pond teaching visitors; indicative of the way life was when the villages were still thriving
- Cultural sites are preserved, protected or restored; resources can support appropriate Hawaiian cultural practices
- The NAR is the same but enhanced; fish pond restored; cultural sites protected
- Cultural sites protected
- Enfold local people into management; professionalize them; make them an integral part of our plan for a sustainable future
- Appreciate highly protected nature of reserve; sense of ownership and desire to protect
- Hawaiian groups protect cultural sites
- Cultural sites restored and/or preserved
- No additional destruction to lava/trails
- No toilet paper on ground; back to pristine conditions

- Human use limited and controlled

Funding & Management

- Generates own revenue
- Model of management; gateway for learning, getting a deeper understanding of Hawaii's unique resources; not overbuilt, just the right amount of management
- Well managed park under the federal; to become a national park run type of management; or have the feds manage it because of the funding; residence for staff around the NAR; invite all residents and visitors to visit – example Haleakala National Park (and Kipahulu)
- Area is managed comprehensively starting with entrance before Makena Beach, i.e. State park Plan of the 1970s.
- Occasional presence of government management to remind people that the government cares for and manages the area. Everyone recognizes that it is a reserve. It has sustainable funding
- Ahihi will be protected forever for future generations untouched and unmodified as much as possible
- Planning for protection of larger coastline moving forward

Recovery & Preservation

- Thriving natural resources not threatened by development
- NAR closed completely to everyone; a natural sanctuary to all landscape and creatures without any human impacts
- Entering the NAR is like stepping back in time. The area is calm, serene, and historic.
- Resources are thriving. Landscape is intact.
- Coral healthy, recovering
- Anchialine pools recovering
- Value of the NAR – Everything! Uniqueness; habitat, what it provides.
- Visions of the future: invasive plants removed and replaced with native species; native animals flourishing
- Ecosystems are recovered and complete; invasive plants and animals are gone; native and endemic plants and animals are recovering; historic plants and animals are returning
- Maintain the untouched, pristine, unique feeling of Ahihi-Kinau
- Oasis in the lava; natural beauty; lava flow and vent; opihi; abundant fish; unimpacted resources; a place for hands-on learning experiences; a place to gain an appreciation of natural resources.
- Close to dense settlement areas, but retails empty air feel and native ecosystems of more remote areas such as Puu O Kali.

10:45 am - Capacity Assessment

As a large group we conducted a capacity assessment for the ʻĀhihi-Kīnaʻu NAR around six key topics, institutional leadership, staff leadership, multi-disciplinary, legal

framework, funding, and community / constituency support. Below are the raw comments and votes taken before and after the discussion on each topic.

Institutional Leadership

- Fundamental problem with communication and coordination inside institution and outside institution
- Institutional framework is present, framework is clear
- County is a big player
- Need to include other groups in process
- Who are the leaders
- Don't know what we want to do
- Decisions come from one place (Honolulu) communication to top is problematic

Staff Leadership

- Considered Maui NARS staff
- Do the best with what they have
- If no leadership training its hard don't have enough "tools in the toolbox"
- Need good stuff from start
- Core competency in land based management not in park management, human and marine management
- Needs specialization
- People staff great-need to increase competency
- Multi-disciplinary (people skills?)

Scoring:
Good-7
Fair-8
Poor-3

Multi-Disciplinary

- Utilization and involvement rather than access
- Emphasis on multi-disc
- Better availability of support people
- Cultural capacity building
- Marine leadership
- People are there-need to utilize
- Utilization of available resources is very important
- Have opportunity to do their best with resources
- Lu'uwai family is a resource
- Lu'uwai request to go fishing was met. Utilize the local community and commercial users
- Advisory group taps into multi-disc team and Lu'uwai family
- A community based group is there and needs to be included-Available

- Few examples where lots of different people are involved. But for this issue-we have various people involved especially at the capacity level

Pre Scoring:
V Good-1
Good-8
Fair-8
Poor-1

Post Scoring:
V Good-1
Good-8
Fair-9
Poor-0

Legal Framework

- Rules don't appear to be enforceable lots of steps to get rules enforced
- Too many rule changes on commercial use and cultural. NAR has identified all those problems
- Recent rule changes have improved the framework
- Has most restrictive legal framework in Hawaii-but not internationally. It is also the highest in Hawaii.
- This NAR can strengthen all the NARS
- DAR report-assessment of Lu'uwai permit done by the people on Maui. Compares to NWHI situation
- Cultural-we preserved the place
- Used to fish with lau. Did that for years. Limited access to area.
- Families only go with other families that know
- Lu'uwai family-throw net, pick 'opihi
- In court-$5,$10 fine NAR violation. There is no understanding in court
- Don't have all tools in framework
- NARS-L.F. is good. Better ways to deal with civil penalties. Department is improving in this area. Overall good.
- Ahupua'a system management

Pre-Scoring:
V Good-5
Good-8
Fair-3
Poor-1

Post Scoring:
V Good-4
Good-10
Fair-4

Funding

- Economic downturn different in last two months has been incredible
- Relative because compared with other places other sites don't have much
- Equal treatment in NARS
- Coastal areas have more problems tasked to protect 180 ecosystems
- 46 people statewide to manage 20 NARS
- Entry fees for state or directly to ʻĀhihi-Kīnaʻu - Have to be innovative NGO funding to support protectors
- Overall capacity-DLNR is under funded. ʻĀhihi-Kīnaʻu is much better but lacks funding to do the job
- Poor because it will take a lot of resources to manage that area
- Entrance Fee-a reason how to comprehensively manage area.
- Cannot only focus on ʻĀhihi-Kīnaʻu, DLNR gets less than 2% of state budget

Pre Scoring:
V Good-0
Good-2
Fair-6
Poor-9

Post scoring:
V Good-0
Good-0
Fair-7
Poor-10

Community Constituency Support

- Good but a divided constituency. People love the area but are divided on management.
- Really upset that the place is shut down. Users are not involved in the solution and overall are not engaged.
- Fault of department because there needs to be a better effort to work with NGO's-the native Hawaiian Community
- Similar to multi-disc theme. Quite a bit of interest in community capacity to draw in community
- Fair because failed to engage key community-halau, canoe clubs, in contrast to other divisions, we are doing pretty good, setting a model.
- Potential of area-people need to know the importance of Hawaiian cultural and the ambiance of the experience. Bridge true appreciation
- As time goes by amazed at what the public thinks is compatible. Public is different than they used to be
- Cannot take students in-if you want to take canoe clubs. Make way to involve constituents
- Permit process

Pre-scoring:
V good-0
Good-5
Fair-10
Poor-0

Post Scoring:
V good-0
Good-3
Fair-13
Poor-1

1:00 pm - Goal, objective and strategy development
Instructions and definitions were given on the development of goals, objectives and strategies in preparation for the development of these products. Due to limited time, we used a general goal of "improved NAR resource values". We broke into four groups, three which focused on threat abatement objective and strategies for the top ranked threats, utilizing the situation analyses from Day 1. The fourth group chose a capacity enhancement objective. Later in the afternoon, the groups rotated, so that participants were able to work on developing two objectives. Below are the definitions given to the groups and the group work.

A good goal:
- Is brief
- Relates to your vision
- Is broad
- Is simple to understand and communicate
- Can be measureable

A good objective is SMART:
- Specific
- Measurable
- Accomplishment focused
- Realistic and achievable
- Time bound

A strategic action is a broad or general course of action to reach one or more objectives. A good strategic action is
- Linked – directly related to a specific objective
- Strategic – maximizes leverage and efficiency
- Focused – outlines specific steps for implementing the action
- Feasible – accomplishable with resources and constraints
- Appropriate – fall within social and cultural norms for place

Objectives and Strategies - Group 1

Threats: Destruction of formations, rock removal, vandalism to lava and lava tube caves, reconstruction of archeological features / Native Hawaiian and regional culture and history not preserved or shared

Objective: Manage visitor use to eliminate damage to natural and cultural resources by creating and implementing a visitor plan by Aug 2010

Objective/strategy brain storm

- Allow/ accepted outreach/communication manager to complete and implement strategic communication plan for A-K
- Create a new organizational structure
- Outside structure to hold NAR accountable
- Road/NARS staff
- Supervisory training team building
- Quarterly Advisory group meetings and progress reports
- Messages and signage at Makena State park
- Gate across road to limit access
- Limit access to 50/hour or 200 people per day
- Gain ownership of road (identify obstacles)
- Rental car company communication
- Hire a PR person to focus
- NARS staff needs work plan
- Appropriate signage (systematic signage, implement sign study, better interpretive signage)
- Implement fees – need to alter administrative rules
- Address cell phone and radio repeater issues (no reception)
- Need NAR enforcement officers? Increase DOCARE presence
- Go to a video before entering A-K
- Guided tour to prevent trampling/build awareness
- Decide where to put trails
- Designated snorkeling sites
- Ensure access/preference is provided to educational and cultural groups

Objectives and Strategies - Group 2

Threat: Too many people and cars, lacking awareness

Objective 1: DLNR to assume ownership and authority over the Makena-Keoneoio government road within two years.

Strategies:

Visitor center and/or signage at Makena State park to educate visitors

Explore legislative means to achieve objective (bills/resolutions)
Keep roads unimproved
Seek legal advice on liability issues related with road

Objective 2: Determine capacity and legal feasibility of a user fee to support NAR management within one year.

Threat: Foot traffic and trampling

Objective 3: Establish a system of trails that have limited, controlled (w/ purpose driven activities) access and use by Aug 1, 2010.

Objectives and Strategies - Group 3

Capacity issue: Insufficient and unreliable funding

Objective: By 2012, secure additional, stable sources of funding to meet management needs.

Strategy: Charge an entrance fee where revenues are dedicated solely for the protection and management of the Ahihi-Kinau NAR.

Objectives and Strategies - Group 4

Threat: Current and proposed development
Objective1: Prevent development from encroaching past Puu Olai.*
Objective 2: Contain development related pollutants to XX level.

Strategy
Aquire/trade lands adjacent to the NAR.

Brainstorm

- Require developers to meet higher standard of environmental compliance
- Responsible development follows the ordinances and permitting processes
- If resorts renovate they must keep current footprint (no expansion)
- Return sewage flow to Kihei; re-use waste water on landscape in Wailea
- Retain natural landscape/viewplane in development
- Identify landowners; evaluate land swap, purchase
- Acquire the land adjacent to the NAR or put in land trust or conserve easement
- No golf courses past puu olai to prevent seepage of nutrients
- Identify zoning in areas (inside and outside the reserve) if its appropriate to change it
- Hold the current in-holdings to current footprint – no Condiminimization

- Provide information to planning department/agencies/communities about pending development
- Launch awareness campaign – coalition formation for NGOs, residents
- Identify expert witnesses for testimony on threats to the NAR
- Land division –doing stuff

3:45 pm Next steps, evaluation, wrap up

The third and final meeting of the work group will be on December 17. The site visit will be on December 5. All meetings are publicly noticed and open to the public. Participants filled out an evaluation form. Mahalo nui to all the participants and to the facilitation team. Aloha a hui hou.

4:00 pm Meeting Adjourned