

# State of the Park Report for Kalaupapa National Historical Site

## Scoping Workshop and Report Development Documentation

May 3, 2012

### 1. Introduction

---

This document provides background information and methods used to develop the 2015 State of the Park report for Kalaupapa National Historical Site, including a summary of the scoping workshop process, the list of participants involved in the scoping workshop and the assessments of resource condition, and notes to document why certain decisions or assessments were made.

A State of the Park report will be developed for each park to “assess the overall status of park resources and use this information to improve park priority setting and communicate complex park condition information to the public in a clear and simple way” ([NPS Call to Action Plan](#)). The report is a truthful assessment of the overall condition of priority park resources and values, irrespective of the ability of the park superintendent or the National Park Service to influence it. The purpose of each report is to:

- Provide to visitors and the American public a snapshot of the status and trend in the condition of a park’s priority resources and values.
- Summarize and communicate complex scientific, scholarly, and park operations factual information and expert opinion using non-technical language and a visual format.
- Highlight park stewardship activities and accomplishments to maintain or improve the State of the Park.
- Identify key issues and challenges facing the park to help inform park management planning.

State of the Park reports bring a standardized approach to assessing the condition of priority resources and values for a park, and for communicating the condition summaries. The reports focus on the priority resources and values of the park based on the park’s purpose and significance, as described in the park’s Foundation Document or General Management Plan. The assessments of resource condition are based upon the best available scientific and scholarly research, reports, and publications, which are cited and linked to throughout the report and the associated “drill-down website version” of the report, but the condition assessments also involve expert opinion and the professional judgment of park staff and the subject matter experts involved in developing the report. The in-depth knowledge by park staff of park resources and recent events and activities, plus their expertise from being involved in the day-to-day practice of all aspects of park stewardship, are reflected throughout this report.

The status and trends in the condition of priority park resources and values are continually changing, and this State of the Park Report will require updating as new data and understanding for the resources becomes available. A full revision of the report is expected every five years; however, incremental updates may be made periodically between major revisions.

### 2. Approach and Methodology

---

#### 2.1 Definition of Key Terms

- **Fundamental and Other Important Resources and Values:** Fundamental resources and values are the particular systems, processes, experiences, scenery, sounds, and other features that are key to achieving the park’s purposes and maintaining its significance. Other important resources and values are those attributes that are determined to be particularly important to park management and planning, although they are not central to the park’s purpose and significance. These priority resources are identified in the Park Foundation Document and/or General Management Plan. The short-cut name that will be used for this will be **Priority Resources**.

- **Desired Conditions:** A qualitative description of the integrity and character for a set of resources and values, including visitor experiences, that park management has committed to achieve and maintain. These Desired Conditions are tied to the Park Foundation Document and/or General Management Plan.
- **Indicator of Condition:** A selected subset of components or elements of a Priority Resource (i.e., a Fundamental or Other Important Resource or Value for the park) that are particularly “information rich” and that represent or “indicate” the overall condition of the Priority Resource. There may be one or several indicators of condition for a particular Priority Resource.
- **Specific Measure of Condition:** One or more specific measurements used to quantify or qualitatively evaluate the condition of an Indicator at a particular place and time. There may be one or more Specific Measures of Condition for each Indicator of Condition.
- **Current Condition:** The current quantifiable or otherwise objective value or range of values for an Indicator or Specific Measure of Condition based on scientific data or scholarly analysis.

## 2.2 Symbols Used to Communicate State and Trend in Resource Condition

The Status and Trend symbols used throughout the State of the Park report are summarized in the following key. The background color (Green, Yellow, or Red) represents the current condition of a resource, the direction of the arrow summarizes the trend in condition, and the thickness of the outside line represents the degree of confidence in the assessment of condition based on available data and understanding. In some cases, the arrow is omitted because data are not sufficient for calculating a trend (e.g., data from a one-time inventory or insufficient sample size).

| Condition Status  |                               | Trend in Condition  |                            | Confidence in Assessment  |        |
|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------------------|---|--------|
|  | Warrants Significant Concern  |  | Condition is Improving     |  | High   |
|  | Warrants Moderate Concern     |  | Condition is Unchanging    |  | Medium |
|  | Resource is in Good Condition |  | Condition is Deteriorating |  | Low    |

Examples of how the symbols should be interpreted:



Resource is in good condition, its condition is improving, high confidence in the assessment.



Condition of resource warrants moderate concern; condition is unchanging; medium confidence in the assessment.



Condition of resource warrants significant concern; trend in condition is unknown or not applicable; low confidence in the assessment.

## 2.3 Rules for Combining Multiple Status and Trend Symbols

The overall assessment of the condition for a Priority Resource or Value may be based on a combination of the status and trend of multiple indicators and specific measures of condition. A set of rules are proposed for summarizing the overall Status of a particular Priority Resource based on assessments of Status for two or more specific measures of condition, and for summarizing the overall Trend for the resource based on multiple Trend arrows. The proposed set of rules, based on an approach used by Parks Canada Agency to develop State of the Park reports, is as follows:

### Condition:

To determine the combined condition, each red symbol is assigned zero points, each yellow symbol is assigned 50 points, and each green symbol 100 points. Calculate the average, and apply the scale below to determine the resulting color.

| Score 0 to 33 | Score 34 to 66 | Score 67 to 100 |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Red           | Yellow         | Green           |

### Trend:

To determine the overall trend, subtract the total number of down arrows from the total number of up arrows. If the result is 3 or greater, the overall trend is up. If the result is -3 or lower, the overall trend is down. If the result is between 2 and -2, the overall trend is unchanged.

## 3. Scoping Workshop Agenda and Participants

---

The Kalaupapa NHS State of the Park workshop was held at park headquarters at Kalaupapa, Molokai, Hawaii, on May 1-3, 2012. Prior to the workshop, the State of the Park team from Colorado and from the Pacific Island I&M Network based at Hawaii Volcanoes National Park reviewed the recently-developed Foundation Document, sections from the draft General Management Plan, the 2010 Natural Resource Condition Assessment, and other scientific and scholarly documents and datasets to prepare for the workshop. See Appendix 1 for the workshop agenda.

---

### 3.1 Participants in Development of the State of the Park Report

| Name                 | Title                             | e-mail address       | Notes/Comments |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Steve Prokop         | KAHO Superintendent               | steve_prokop@nps.gov |                |
| Dr. Eric Brown       | Marine Ecologist                  | Eric_brown@nps.gov   |                |
| Erika Stein          | Cultural Resource Program Manager |                      |                |
| Arthur Ainoa         | Recycle/Grounds Supervisor        |                      |                |
| Lionell Kaawaloa Sr. | Maintenance Supervisor            |                      |                |
| Keolei Pescaia       | HP                                | [see insideNPS list] |                |
| Tony Langella        | Maintenance Worker                |                      |                |
| David Ainoa          | Auto mechanic                     |                      |                |

|                  |  |                        |  |
|------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| Jeff English     | Maintenance worker   |                        |  |
| Julie Long??     | Cultural Resource Management                               |                        |  |
| Edith Malache    | HP   |                        |  |
| Steve Juntikka   | Maintenance mechanic                                       |                        |  |
| Amy Sakurada     | Law Enforcement Ranger                                     |                        |  |
| Momi Hooper      | Cultural Resource Management                               |                        |  |
| Mike Heacock     | Facilities Management                                      |                        |  |
| Mary Jane Naone  | Archeologist   |                        |  |
| Kellie M. Ellis  | CRM volunteer  |                        |  |
| Richard Miller   | Historic Preservation/CR                                   |                        |  |
| Randall Watanuki | Kokua  |                        |  |
| Kim Tice         | Biotech  |                        |  |
| Paul Hosten      | Terrestrial Ecologist                                      |                        |  |
| Scott Williams   | Curator  |                        |  |
| Dr. Greg Kudray  | I&M Network Program Manager,<br>Pacific Island I&M Network | greg_kudray@nps.gov    |  |
| Dr. Steve Fancy  | I&M Supervisory Ecologist                                  | steve_fancy@nps.gov    |  |
| Dr. Tom Philippi | I&M Quantitative Ecologist                                 | tom_philippi@nps.gov   |  |
| Margaret Beer    | I&M Lead Data Manager                                      | margaret_beer@nps.gov  |  |
| Fagan Johnson    | I&M Asst Data Manager                                      | fagan_johnson@nps.gov  |  |
| Dr. Brent Frakes | I&M Ecologist  | brent_frakes@nps.gov   |  |
| Simon Kingston   | I&M Ecologist  | simon_kingston@nps.gov |  |

#### 4. Notes/Comments about Decisions Made in Selecting the List of Priority Resources and Values, Indicators of Condition, and Specific Measures of Condition and Assessing the Condition of Priority Resources

---

The internet version of the park's State of the Park report, available at <http://www.nps.gov/stateoftheparks/kala/>, provides detailed information and sources of information for the resources summarized in the report, including references, accounts on the origin and quality of the data, and the methods and analytical approaches used in the assessments. The intent of the "drill-down website version" is to allow the reader to access the large amount of complex scientific and scholarly data and information upon which the assessments of condition are based. There will be some situations in which it may not be clear how the assessments were made based on the underlying "evidence" available through the website version plus the professional expertise of the participants. The information and notes in the table below are intended to assist the readers and reviewers of the report in understanding why certain decisions were made as part of summarizing a large amount of complex data and information and professional judgment for the purposes of communicating the information to visitors and the public.

##### 4.1 Notes/Comments about the List of Priority Resources Used in the Report

| Priority Resource or Value | Notes/Comments |
|----------------------------|----------------|
|                            |                |
|                            |                |

#### 4.2 Natural Resources Section

| Priority Resource | Notes/Comments |
|-------------------|----------------|
|                   |                |
|                   |                |
|                   |                |

#### 4.3 Cultural Resources Section

| Priority Resource | Notes/Comments |
|-------------------|----------------|
|                   |                |
|                   |                |
|                   |                |

#### 4.4 Visitor Experience Section

| Priority Resource | Notes/Comments |
|-------------------|----------------|
|                   |                |
|                   |                |
|                   |                |
|                   |                |
|                   |                |
|                   |                |
|                   |                |

#### 4.5 Park Infrastructure Section

| Report Component               | Notes/Comments  |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Facility Condition Index (FCI) | Facility condition data extracted from NPS Facility Management Software System (FMSS): Deferred Maintenance (DM) and Current Replacement Value (CRV) are summed by Asset Category for all assets with "Operating", "Oper/Obso", or "Inactive" Status. Each Asset Category's FCI is calculated by dividing its subtotaled DM by its subtotaled CRV. The park's Overall FCI is calculated by dividing its total DM by its total CRV. A lower FCI indicates a better condition. To achieve standardization between 2008 and 2013, 2008 CRV is multiplied by (1.7774 ÷ 1.45), resulting in 2008 Adjusted CRV. |
| FCI Condition Status           | FCI ≤ 0.100 the facility is in <b>Good</b> condition<br>0.100 > FCI ≤ 0.150 the facility warrants <b>Moderate</b> concern<br>FCI > 0.150 the facility warrants <b>Significant</b> concern   |
| FCI Condition Trend            | Based on calculated percentage change in FCI: (2013 FCI - 2008 FCI) ÷ 2008 FCI.<br>Up Arrow: FCI improved by > 10% over the 5 years<br>Unchanged: FCI is within plus or minus 10%, 2013 vs. 2008<br>Down Arrow: FCI degraded by > 10% over the 5 years  |
| API/FCI Scatter Plot           | Retrieved from AMRS. For more information, refer to:<br><a href="http://www.nps.gov/stateoftheparks/assets/docs/Park_Facility_Management_Terminology_and_Concepts.pdf">http://www.nps.gov/stateoftheparks/assets/docs/Park_Facility_Management_Terminology_and_Concepts.pdf</a>   |
| Energy                         | Energy and Water consumption data were downloaded from the NPS Energy Management Database and   |

|                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Consumption and Water Consumption | Reporting System for the five years of 2008-2012. Building gross square footage data were also obtained from the Energy Management database. Data were analyzed, and graphics produced, using some code written for the R statistical package. |
| Park Carbon Footprint             | Text and the graphic were obtained from the Climate Friendly Park website, <a href="http://www.nps.gov/climatefriendlyparks/">http://www.nps.gov/climatefriendlyparks/</a>   |

## 4.6 Other Notes or Comments

### Appendix 1. Workshop Agenda

#### Wednesday, May 2, 2012

8:00 Welcome and Introductions – Steve Prokop, Superintendent

Overview of State of the Park reporting: What we are doing, why it is important – Steve Fancy

Review examples of the proposed products: the State of the Park report itself, a “drill-down” website that links to data and reports upon which the evaluations of resource condition are based, the workshop report, and the “multi-purpose database behind the scenes”.

Review and agree on the initial list of Priority Resources and Values, and some associated indicators and measures of condition for them, based on the park’s Purpose and Significance statements from the Foundation Document

Initial group discussion, Focus on a few of the Priority Resources for which we have better data on status and trends, some of the indicators of condition and specific measures of condition, and how we would summarize and communicate a lot of complex information.

#### Break

Group discussion continued, about what each Breakout Group should work on.

Breakout Groups: Divide into three Breakout Groups (Natural Resources, Cultural Resources, Visitor Experience) to work on Priority Resources and Values, Indicators of Condition, Specific Measures of Condition.

#### Lunch

1:00 Reconvene the larger group: Review discussions from the morning and any problem areas or questions

Group discussion: Begin to develop a list of the stewardship actions and activities that the park is doing to maintain or improve the condition of priority resources and values.

What are some of the accomplishments and “stories” that we want to highlight in the report?

Breakout Groups continue their discussion of indicators and specific measures of condition for the priority resources and values identified by the group.

Identify and prioritize specific data sets or reports that could be summarized as a graph, chart, or map or as a short story in the report, or in the more detailed website and database that supports the report.

4:00 Group discussion: Reconvene all staff and discuss the day’s progress, and plans for Thursday.

4:30 Adjourn for the day

## Thursday, May 3, 2012

8:00 Review progress from yesterday: Priority Resources and Values, Indicators of Condition, and Specific Measures of Condition for priority resources to be included in the Kalaupapa State of the Park report.

Continue group discussion about management/stewardship actions that the park is taking to maintain or improve resource condition.

Group discussion: What are the key issues that need to be considered for management planning, and that we want to communicate to visitors, other stakeholders, and the general public? Agree on how to develop this section of the report.

### Break

Breakout groups: Additional time in smaller groups to continue discussions and assess the condition of priority resources.

### Lunch

1:00 Reconvene the larger group: Review progress for each of the four sections of the report.

Identify any additional needs for data analysis or producing graphics to summarize park data sets. Identify any documents that provide the basis for the condition assessments and “stories” and that need to be uploaded into the IRMA data system.

Assign action items: determine who will do what by when for each of the selected “stories” that will be included in the report or on the website. Make sure we have met all of the objectives of the workshop.

4:00 Or whenever appropriate - Adjourn the larger workshop, but use the remaining time for people to work individually or in small groups on writing assignments, sketching out possible chart/graph/summary table/maps for communicating status and trend information, gathering up documents to upload to the IRMA data system.

The visiting subject-matter experts will be available anytime during the workshop to meet with people individually or in small groups to further discuss ideas, compile data sets, enter data into the database, help with analyzing data and creating charts/graphs/maps, and begin writing sections of the report.

## Friday, May 4, 2012

State of the Parks team departs on 9:45 am flight