

Personal Statements

Study Group members were invited to submit brief 'personal statements' of their individual views on the process, issues, or outcomes related to this report. These personal statements were not edited or reviewed, nor do they necessarily reflect the beliefs or opinions of other Study Group members. They are attached here in their entirety.

Personal statement: David Itano

When I was invited to join this study group it took a while to make up my mind. I recognized it “made sense” to recruit me to the task since I know the local fisheries and formerly held the position of Recreational Fisheries Coordinator for NOAA’s Pacific Islands Regional Office. I hesitated to engage as I was not confident that my views would be fairly represented in the final product, whatever that might be. I finally agreed to take part in the group, going on the belief that it’s better to engage and have a voice in the process rather than let others speak for you.

I was beginning to regret my decision at the first meeting when draft materials, already well developed, were suggesting that the desired outcome from the “Group” would be to select and promote a single “Preferred Alternative” licensing system for Hawaii. The suggestion was to examine options and select the “best way forward” to be available to advise the legislature

Some of us argued that any suggestion of a “BEST” or “ONLY” way to proceed would doom the process from the start. This issue has been around a long time and that very TOP DOWN mentality was what had so alienated the fishing community that any possibility of rational discussion and debate was lost. I am pleased that our views were adopted and incorporated into this report.

Previous attempts to introduce a non-commercial saltwater accounting system failed due in part to a lack of information that was made available to the public, the fishing community and our legislators. Significantly, the State failed to conduct outreach, meetings and discussion with the public as part of a collective dialogue. The critical conversation with affective stakeholders never occurred. How rude and short sighted. Consider this as an information resource and the “homework” that wasn’t previously done.

This document is an attempt to address these information gaps and provide the community with the information and tools necessary to have an informed discussion on the pros and cons of a registry, permit or licensing system to account for non-commercial saltwater fishing activity in Hawaii. I hope you find it useful and informative.

Mahalo, David



November 25, 2016

**SUBJECT: STATEMENT REGARDING: A NON-COMMERCIAL FISHING REGISTRY.
PERMIT AND LICENSE STUDY FOR THE STATE OF HAWAI'I: FINDINGS
REPORT DECEMBER 2016**

Kua'āina Ulu 'Auamo (KUA) submits this statement on its representative's participation in "A Non-Commercial Fishing Registry. Permit and License Study for the State of Hawai'i: Findings Report, December 2016."

KUA works to empower communities to improve their quality of life through caring for their environmental heritage together; an activity commonly referred to as community-based natural resource management. We employ a community-driven approach that currently supports a network of more than 31 mālama 'āina community groups collectively referred to as E Alu Pū (move forward together), almost 40 fishpond projects and practitioners called the Hui Mālama Loko I'a, and a new and growing network of Limu practitioners (Limu Hui) all from across our state.

A primary function of KUA includes development of the 'auwai, a stream of resources, tools, bridges and networks that help to cultivate and take our communities' work to greater levels of collective impact. Research that helps to inform and improve community co-management efforts are one of the tools. The concept of non-commercial registry/permit/license (RPL) program is at its heart a centralized governance mechanism for managing fisheries. Though the bulk of our work is to encourage reasonable and responsible decentralization, especially in rural and Native Hawaiian communities-we also understand that an extreme view of either approach to governance can lead to dysfunction, abuse and the monopolization of power.

KUA was engaged in part to help provide feedback on the sentiments of and effects on rural and Native Hawaiian fishing communities and more importantly connect the facilitators to those in our networks from rural and Native Hawaiian communities who have an informed view on the subject matter.

As the study states this fact finding committee takes no opinion on the necessity or effectiveness of RPL programs. The study also acknowledges that deeper dialogue, broader outreach and input is necessary, a finding which KUA strongly agrees with.

Centralized and de-centralized approaches to governance can go hand in hand especially when the resources to do so are available. We also hope that beyond thinking about a program the need for our state to consider more resources for the mālama of Hawai'i beyond regulating fishing is not lost in the dialogue. This includes funding, people and the political will and capacity to care for and restore that which feeds us in mind, body and soul.

Pūpūkahi i holomua e ho'okanaka
(Let's unite to better the human condition)

Kevin K.J. Chang
Executive Director

Re: Study Group on the Feasibility of a Non-Commercial Marine Registry, Permit, or License System for Hawai'i

Hawai'i is the only coastal state in the US without a recreational or noncommercial marine fishing license or registry system. In my view, this places Hawai'i at a significant disadvantage in several critical ways. First, it creates significant data gaps that limit management effectiveness. Managers have little or incomplete information about the catch and fishing effort in state waters, which limits the effectiveness of management decisions. Put another way, you can't manage what you don't understand. Second, it results in missed opportunities for engagement and dialogue among fishers and managers. Fishers and managers across the state are seeking effective channels through which to engage in meaningful dialogue to design, test, and implement solutions for better fisheries management. Third, lacking a fee-based license results in missed opportunities to produce significant financial resources for fisheries management. The state investment in DLNR is extremely low at 1% of state funds, which ranked Hawai'i as the 50th state in terms of funding for fish and wildlife management in 1994. This hasn't changed much – in 2013 DLNR received less than 1.5% of the state's budget, a per capita investment lower than most states, including Iowa.

This report represents a collective approach to build a strong foundation (ho'okahua) for a non-commercial fisheries licensing, permit, or registration system. As the leader of a conservation non-profit group, I am acutely aware of the earlier controversies surrounding previous initiatives to explore a non-commercial license. I feel that these previous failed initiatives had at least two characteristics in common. First, they were not developed with a diverse set of partners at the table. Second, they did not carry a level of investment commensurate with the challenge of understanding the complexity of a license system and the pros and cons of what that would bring to Hawai'i.

To address these deficiencies, the CI Hawai'i team reached out to see if there was sufficient interest in exploring this topic among some of the leading voices in the fishing community. CI Hawai'i was blessed to be one of the founding partners in this initiative, joined by leadership in the Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council and the Harold K.L. Castle Foundation and with support from the Department of Land and Natural Resources to undertake the study. This was – by design – an uncommon alliance. We recruited other brave souls to form a study team, comprised of an incredible set of thought leaders, change-makers, and community advocates from the diverse constituencies across the state. This diverse coalition agreed with a shared objective that we were coming together to learn from one another – to go on a journey of discovery together. We had able guides in Peter Adler and Keith Mattson, expert facilitators. Leadership and staff from DLNR and the Office of Hawaiian Affairs served

as ex officio members, allowing them to participate fully in the learning process and discussions without committing to any specific finding or position of the group. It was a safe space for this community of practitioners to explore the issues, to challenge each other and our own beliefs, and to think deeply about what problems this management approach might solve.

Second, we were supported at the outset by an incredible set of institutions who believed in the initiative. This includes the leadership of the Harold K.L. Castle Foundation. Eric Co with the foundation was a principal architect of the process in its early stages and was key to the entire initiative. Two programs of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration - the Coral Reef Conservation Program, and the Saltonstall-Kennedy program, also came to the fore to support this work. The program officers for both were instrumental in helping provide the key support for this initiative.

The report is not prescriptive – it does not recommend a preferred approach. Instead, we evaluated a vast and complicated landscape of issues surrounding a potential non-commercial marine fisheries licensing, permit, or registration system. In keeping with the thinking from Silicon Valley “moonshot” innovators, we attacked the hardest parts of the problem first. Our CI Hawai‘i team is proud to be part of this group and to have contributed to the knowledge gathered in this report. Having helped build this strong foundation, we now turn to the important work of supporting the conversation about what next steps will help ensure that Hawai‘i’s oceans continue to benefit our communities – now and into the future.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jack Kittinger". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Jack" being more prominent than the last name "Kittinger".

Jack Kittinger, November 2016