

Fagatele Bay National Marine Sanctuary
Sanctuary Advisory Council Minutes
Monday, 9 February, 2009

Sanctuary Advisory Council (SAC) and Coral Reef Advisory Group (CRAG)

Rose Atoll

- FWS is prepared to draft a comprehensive conservation plan in the near future for Rose Atoll
- American Samoa Government involvement:
 - Cooperating agency for NEPA
 - Currently the role of ASG in the management plan is “wide open”
- The management plan is currently under federal control because that is the authority we have to work under
 - The water around Rose Atoll is all under federal control
 - By contrast the water in Hawaii belongs to the states
 - Emergent land belongs to the territory
 - Inquiry whether the territory will be a legal partner for control over the land
- Inconsistencies appear in the declaration
 - Language/definitions
 - Clarification necessary
- Territorial position can be officially submitted to the Governor’s office and distributed to federal agencies
 - These recommendations should be made outside of the MPR scoping meetings
- Need to identify whether concerns can be addressed at the local level or whether there is a need to go to the federal or presidential level
- Federal resources include:
 - Additional tools
 - Authority outside 3 miles
 - Resources
 - Additional program (i.e. Hyperbaric Chamber)
- Federal government is here at the Governor’s request
- There are federal agencies who do not think that the federal government should be spending money on marine protection in American Samoa
- The territorial government will always have the final say

Fagatele Bay/Additional Sites

- Fagatele Bay could be co-managed at the territorial level under the MPA program
- The Governor has requested a Sanctuary site in his village
- The federal government is not trying to drive the process
- Larson’s cove was intended to be included in the Sanctuary system 15 months after Fagatele Bay was declared a marine sanctuary
- Fagatele Bay is too small to be biologically significant

- The federal government is trying to integrate bio-geographic data to support all partners and not to establish sanctuaries
- Territorial concerns:
 - As a *management* agency, DMWR is concerned with the welfare of the fisherman
 - Will the 20% no take zone include the Sanctuary?
 - The National Park cannot legally be no take unless the village agrees
 - Can the bio-geographic assessment lead to territorial planning?