



**Gulf of Maine
Council on the
Marine Environment**

Meeting Briefing Packet

Working Group • Final Version • March 18, 2009

Portsmouth, NH • March 25-26, 2009

Table of Contents

Working Group Meeting Agenda.....	Page 1
Consent Agenda Items	Page 5
NOAA Marine Spatial Planning Tool Demonstration	Page 11
Supporting Councilors to be more active in Council Affairs	Page 12
BoFEP and RARGOM science events : GOMC participation and support	Page 14
2010 Council Celebratory Event Development	Page 15
Restoration: Going beyond salt march and riverine habitat restoration.....	Page 16
Planning for 2009-2010 Work Plan Priorities	Page 18
Gulf of Maine Communications Strategy.....	Page 20
In Kind Donations Form	Page 33

March 25-26, 2009 Working Group Meeting

Wednesday, March 25, 2009 at the NH Department of Environmental Services Coastal Program Office, Pease International Tradeport, Portsmouth, NH

1:00 PM	<p>Welcome, introductions, and objectives for this meeting <i>Justin Huston, NS Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture and Chair, Gulf of Maine Council Working Group</i></p>
1:10 PM PAGE 5	<p>Consent agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ December 2008 Council decision and action items ▪ December 2008 Working Group decision and action items ▪ Habitat Monitoring Subcommittee Update ▪ Reminder: Please remember to submit to Michele Tremblay your nominations for the Longard, Susan Snow-Cotter, Visionary, and Sustainable Industries awards no later than April 30, 2009.
1:15 PM	<p>Welcome to Portsmouth <i>Tom Ferrini, Mayor of Portsmouth</i></p>
1:30 PM	<p>Marine Resources Plan for Southwest New Brunswick and New Brunswick Coastal Policy <i>Jane Tims, NB Department of Environment</i> Background: Phase II of the Southwest New Brunswick Marine Resource Plan is concluding, with a discussion paper including recommended actions. The paper will be presented to government at the end of March for their response. Outcomes/decisions: Informational</p>
1:45 PM	<p>State of the Gulf report feasibility and support <i>Tim Hall and Jay Walmsley, Department of Fisheries and Oceans</i> Background: A scoping document will be distributed to Working Group members prior to the meeting. Following from WG and Council recommendations in December, the document outlines what a State of the Gulf report might look like and the implications for the Council if it pursues this approach. Outcomes/decisions: The Working Group reviews the outcomes of the scoping exercise and discusses possible next steps regarding a State of the Gulf report.</p>
2:30 PM PAGE 11	<p>NOAA Marine Spatial Planning Tool Demonstration <i>Betsy Nicholson and Adrienne Harrison, NOAA Coastal Services Center</i> Background: NOAA's Coastal Services Center is designing products and tools to assist with marine spatial planning efforts around the U.S. This session will provide an overview and status of both the Multipurpose Marine Cadastre and Legislative Atlas tools as they relate to the GOM region. This demonstration will be followed by a discussion on Council utility of products and desire to be engaged in regional marine spatial planning efforts. This discussion will also be informed by the DFO briefing. Outcomes/decisions: Identify ways in which both Council and individual jurisdictions can benefit from and inform NOAA's products, and what role the Council may want to play in the broader marine spatial planning dialog taking shape in the region.</p>
3:00 PM	<p>Break</p>
3:15 PM PAGE 12	<p>Supporting Councilors to be more active in Council affairs <i>Justin Huston; Michele Tremblay, Council Coordinator; and David Keeley, Development Coordinator</i> Background: The strength and vitality of the Council is tied to the Councilors' commitment to the organization's mission and work plan. At the December WG and Council meetings, there were suggestions about ways to engage Councilors in Council activities, including strengthening Councilor leadership. Outcomes/decisions: Options and strategies that Working Group members can pursue to better engage their public, nonprofit, and business Councilors in playing a champion role in Council activities.</p>

<p>4:00 PM</p> <p>PAGE 14</p>	<p>BoFEP and RARGOM science events: GOMC participation and support <i>Justin Huston</i></p> <p>Background: There is an opportunity for the Council to assist with and participate in the upcoming BoFEP conference in May and the RARGOM symposium in October. Some Councilors, WG members, and committee and sub-committees are already involved with both events; however, there is both a need and opportunity for greater collaboration. This could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage the submission of papers/posters that will help shape the theme sessions • Develop and chair concurrent sessions at the RARGOM event • Encourage sponsorship from members of the Council <p>Outcomes/decisions: Determine Council capacity and potential leads for increased participation in the BoFEP and RARGOM events.</p>
<p>4:30 PM</p> <p>PAGE 15</p>	<p>2010 Council celebratory event development <i>Justin Huston</i></p> <p>Background: In December Council decided that while a major “State of the Gulf” summit event was premature for 2010, a celebratory event recognizing Council’s history and accomplishments was in order for its 20-year anniversary. Theresa Torrent-Ellis was directed by Council to explore options and develop recommendations for the June Council meeting.</p> <p>Outcomes/decisions: WG will receive an update on the current thinking about the scope and scale of the celebratory event, and will provide direction for moving forward with recommendations to Council in June.</p>
<p>5:00 PM</p>	<p>Recess meeting for the day</p>
<p>6:30 PM</p>	<p>Meet in hotel lobby for group supper(s)</p>

Thursday, March 26, 2009 at the NH Department of Environmental Services Coastal Program Office, Pease International Tradeport, Portsmouth, NH

8:30 AM	Time for unfinished business from Day 1 and items removed from consent agenda <i>BYOC: Bring Your Own Caffeine</i>
9:00 AM PAGE 16	Restoration: Going beyond salt marsh and riverine habitat restoration <i>John Catena, NOAA and Co-chair, Habitat Restoration Subcommittee; Peter Alexander, Talking Conservation; and David Keeley</i> Background: Saltmarsh and riverine habitat restoration are priorities for the Council and supported by the GOMC/NOAA restoration partnership grant program. In 2009 public and non-profit interests have coalesced (www.gulfofmaine.org/gomrc) and are preparing a comprehensive CA-US restoration strategy that addresses such issues habitat restoration as well as water quality, species restoration, abandoned fishing gear, and invasive species. Outcomes/decisions: Clarification on 1) the scope and timing of the proposed restoration plan; 2) the process to create the Plan including an early summer stakeholder meeting; 3) the process that Canadian restoration plans and priorities can be identified; and 4) the policy options and recommendations the Council should consider including possible agenda topics for their June meeting.
10:30 AM	Break
10:45 AM PAGE 18 AND BUDGET & TAPAS DOCS. SENT BY EMAIL	Planning for 2009-2010 Work Plan Priorities <i>Justin Huston; Michele Tremblay; Cindy Krum, US Gulf of Maine Association; and David Keeley</i> Background: The Council has confirmed 2009-2010 work plan priorities and requested briefing materials for their June 2009 meeting on those tasks, the deliverables, and the status of funding (e.g., available and required to be obtained). Central to successful completion of these tasks are robust committees with effective Canadian and US leadership. The Tracking Action Plan (TAPAS) tool was developed in response to these directives. Outcomes/decisions: Finalized TAPAS forms, strategies to fortify committee membership and leadership, and fund development recommendations that can be presented to Council in June.
12:15 PM	Lunch on your own
1:30 PM	Planning for 2009-2010 Work Plan Priorities – wrap-up –
2:00 PM	2009/10 Council dues and options for supporting upcoming meeting costs <i>Justin Huston</i> Background: It has come to the attention of the Management and Finance Committee that some jurisdictions may not be able to provide their dues for the 2009/10 Council fiscal year. For many agencies, funding will not become clear until their budgets are determined and approved in June. Without dues, the Council will not be able to maintain the same level of “core” services and activities, including meetings. In the present 09/10 budget, there are limited funds available for meeting costs. Outcomes/decisions: Brainstormed options for different ways to address the coming year’s meeting costs.
2:45 PM PAGE 20	Gulf of Maine Communication Strategy <i>Peter Alexander, Talking Conservation</i> Background: Peter Alexander; Theresa Torrent-Ellis, Outreach Committee Chair; and others have been working on an overarching communication strategy for the Gulf of Maine. This presentation will provide Working Group members with an update on the strategy and how it could strengthen GOMC objectives. Outcomes/decisions: Discussion about how this strategy dovetails with GOMC objectives and how the Outreach Committee could spearhead the effort and provide momentum and a cost-effective single point of contact for the initiative.
3:30 PM	Sustainable Industries and Communities Committee Working Waterfronts draft of questionnaire for policy makers <i>Jane Tims</i> Background: Goal 3 of the Action Plan includes an item on Working Waterfronts, specifically to assess policy makers' knowledge of the issues concerning waterfront access and use by resource users. NBDENV has previously prepared a short presentation to inform policy makers about the issues and has now prepared a draft questionnaire to assess knowledge about working waterfronts. Outcomes/decisions: Working Group is asked to provide comments on the questionnaire and to discuss next steps.

4:00 PM	<p>June meeting planning, request for agenda input, and biennial meeting scheduling update <i>Justin Huston</i></p> <p>Background: During the WG meeting in December, we discussed ways to improve meeting attendance, including scheduling of future meetings well in advance. The Secretariat Team and M&F Committee has identified the following possible meeting dates and locations over the next two years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ June 22-25, 2009 - Halifax, NS ▪ October 7-8, 2009 – ME ▪ December 7-10, 2009 - NH ▪ March 24-25, 2010 - NB ▪ June 21-24, 2010 - NH ▪ September 22-23, 2010 - MA ▪ December 6-9, 2010 - ME <p>Outcomes/decisions: Agreement on tentative meeting dates and locations.</p>
4:15 PM	<p>Time for other business and items removed from consent agenda</p>
4:30 PM	<p>Adjourn</p>



**Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment
Council**
1741 Brunswick Street
Halifax, NS • December 4th , 2008

Action and Decision Items

Councilors present: Mel Coté for Stephen Perkins, Environmental Protection Agency; Tim Hall for Michael Murphy, Department of Fisheries and Oceans; Adrienne Harrison for Pat Kurkul (when Betsy Nicholson is not participating via conference call), National Oceans and Atmospheric Administration; Russ Henry for Rick Doucet, NB Department of Fisheries; W. Donald Hudson, Jr. The Chewonki Foundation; Kim Hughes for Roland Haché, NB Department of Environment; Michael Langman for Mark Parent, NS Department of Environment; Jackie Olsen, Environment Canada; Greg Roach, NS Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture; Susan Russell-Robinson, US Geological Survey for Marvin Moriarty, Department of the Interior; Jennifer Smith, World Wildlife Fund; Lee Sochasky, St. Croix International Waterway Commission; Rob Stephenson, St. Andrews Biological Station; Greg Thompson, Fundy North Fishermen's Association; and Theresa Torrent-Ellis for Kathleen Leyden (is not participating via conference call), ME State Planning Office Coastal Program.

Councilors present via conference call: Kathleen Leyden, ME State Planning Office/ME Coastal Program; Leslie-Ann McGee, MA Office of Coastal Zone Management; Betsy Nicholson for Pat Kurkul, NOAA; Michael Walls for Tom Burack, NH Department of Environmental Services.

Others present: Larry Hildebrand, Environment Canada; Justin Huston, NS Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture; Cindy Krum, US Gulf of Maine Association; Ann Rodney, EPA; Jane Tims, NB Department of Environment; Michelle Chisholm, Administrative Assistant; and Michele L. Tremblay, Council Coordinator.

Others present via conference call: Ted Diers, NH Department of Environmental Services.

Budgets and Action Plan notes

Decision: Council approval of the adjusted budget and an indirect rate of 16.59%.

Action: David and Theresa will keep Justin informed of the level of GOM Times sponsorship so that this can be discussed during the June Meeting.

Action: Justin Huston and Michele Tremblay will work with Jack Schwartz prior to the June meeting to figure out where the critical gaps in the program are.

Action: Justin and Cindy will work together to get a GOMMI contractor position description to Leslie-Ann for her grant and funding efforts.

Action: Secretariat and M&F to work with the Council Chair to have detailed, up-to-date information on each core activity/program funding and human capacity needs prior to the June meeting, as early as April so that Council can come together prepared to find solutions to the committee needs.

Integration of efforts in the Gulf of Maine: Internal and external recommendations

Decision: The Council approved the changes to the organization chart that removed the Sewage Management and Monitoring Subcommittees from Goal 2.

Decision: Justin Huston, Jennifer Smith, and Michele Tremblay will work together to determine the status of the Action Plan tasks assigned to the Habitat Conservation Subcommittee and determine if/how the committee can continue its work.

Action: Jane Tims mentioned that NB Department of Environment staff will be identified to sit as the Canadian Co Chair of the SICC Committee. Tim Hall, DFO will offer a member to the SICC committee.

GOM Summit check-in

Action: The Council will contact RARGOM and BoFEP to explore opportunities for the GOMC might integrate presentations, displays, piggy backed sessions, or other events.



Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment
Working Group
Halifax, NS • December 2nd- 3rd, 2008

Action and Decision Items

Working Group members in attendance:

Jennifer Hackett, Department of Fisheries and Oceans; Tim Hall, Department of Fisheries and Oceans; Adrienne Harrison, National Oceans and Atmospheric Administration; Russ Henry, NB Department of Agriculture and Aquaculture; Larry Hildebrand, Environment Canada; Justin Huston, NS Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture; Michael Langman, NS Department of Environment; Gary Lines, Environment Canada; Kathryn Parlee, Environment Canada; Susan Russell-Robinson, US Geological Survey (for the Department of the Interior); Ann Rodney, EPA; Jack Schwartz, MA Division of Marine Fisheries; Jane Tims, NB Department of Environment; and Theresa Torrent-Ellis, ME State Planning Office Coastal Program.

Others present: Paul Boudreau, COINAtlantic; Heather Breeze, Department of Fisheries and Oceans; Michelle Chisholm, Administrative Assistant; Jennifer Smith, World Wildlife Fund; Rob Stephenson, Senior Science Councilor, St. Andrews Biological Station; Cindy Krum, US Gulf of Maine Association; Michele L. Tremblay, Council Coordinator; and Maxine Westhead, Department of Fisheries and Oceans.

Consent Agenda

The consent agenda was approved.

Action Agenda

Climate Change Network

Action: Theresa Torrent-Ellis should work with Gulf of Maine Times Editor, Nancy Griffin, to explore possibility of editing and publishing the climate change articles that the Climate Change Network created last year.

Action: CCN (Gary Lines) and the Outreach Committee (Theresa Torrent-Ellis) to discuss the services and assistance that the OC could provide.

Action: Gary Lines to network with Kyla Milne at NS Environment and Paul Jorden at NB Environment regarding the NRCAN RAC proposal, and Adrienne Harrison at NOAA regarding NROC's coastal hazards work plan. Gary should help to create linkages between these two initiatives, and seek potential funding for complimentary CCN activities.

Budget and Fund Development Updates

Action: The WG recommends that Council approve the adjusted budget and indirect rate.

Action: WG members to consider donating to the Gulf of Maine Times online.

Action: M&F to continue to work to identify deliverables vs. services for the core programs and activities.

Integration of efforts in the Gulf of Maine: internal and external options for Council consideration

Decision: The Working Group recommends that the Council discontinue the Monitoring and Sewage Management Subcommittees under Goal 2.

Decision: The Working Group recommends that the Council adopt the Management and Finance and Secretariat Team revised Terms of Reference.

Action: Secretariat Team to discuss fiscal/capacity realities for next year and how to maximize support for NH Secretariat year.



Action: Justin, Adrienne, Michele, and Jen Smith will act on the October meeting action item and work with Hilary and Al to determine the best way forward for the Habitat Conservation subcommittee.

Action: Gary Lines and Adrienne Harrison will network about potential linkages between planned CCN activities and NROC work plan

Action: Tim Hall will initiate contact with NOAA CSC to discuss transboundary federal agency marine spatial planning integration. This will be an update or a structured discussion on a possible role for the Council in this process as a March Working Group agenda item.

Action: Adrienne to provide update at March WG meeting on possibility of utilizing the Coastal Services Center's social networking tool to explore one or more Council core program areas.

Gulf of Maine Summit and State of the Environment Report

Decision: The Working Group recommends that the Council consider the Summit as a celebratory event which will highlight lessons learned over the past 20-years and perhaps kick-off a longer-term SOE process.

Decision: Recommend that Council task Theresa to take the lead on developing the event Steering Committee, and that Council will relinquish the planning and organization of the event to a Steering Committee that will include Councilors, Working Group members, and individuals from other organizations.

Decision: Councilors and Working Group members will be asked to volunteer their ideas and their participation for the structure and outcome for the event and for participation on the Steering Committee. The GOMC must be aware of how to organize and fund an effort with a Task Force or a Steering Committee.

Decision: The Working Group recommends that the since the Council does not have the resources to produce a comprehensive scientific report, nor is ESIP in a position to contribute fully to such a report, that it focus on identifying next steps for a longer-term process to produce a SOE report for the Gulf. Councilor Rob Stephenson agreed to take the lead on championing this initiative with the Council.

COINAtlantic and GOMC: Opportunities for Collaboration

Action: Presentation and discussion of the US and Canadian Cadastres will be added to the March Working Group meeting agenda.

Update on WWF-Canada information products in support of conservation planning – Jennifer Smith- WWF-Canada

Action: Adrienne, Tim and Jennifer will discuss current and planned marine spatial planning activities and interests in the Gulf and report back at the next WG meeting.



Work Planning and Fund Development :
Justin Huston, Michele Tremblay and Cindy Krum

Building a better work plan format and process

<i>Problem</i>	<i>Suggestions</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lack of capacity: people ▪ Resource committee is under-utilized ▪ Lack of Councilor buy-in or commitment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Councilors need to be invested ▪ Overarching communications campaign for the GOMC in the region (what are the messages?) ▪ Councilors need to commit to build into staff time the GOMC's work (not as a volunteer) ▪ Committee/subcommittee chairs need a process to implement their work (TOR?) where they are required to convene conference calls or meetings on a scheduled basis ▪ Utilizing different Councilors differently (at WG and committee/subcommittee levels) ▪ Champions (and challenges from champions) on a commitment of resources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Communication and collaboration between committees/subcommittees and the WG and Council 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Online collaboration tools such as Plone used by ESIP, Habitat Restoration, and GOMMI and provide invitations to the WG members and Councilors ▪ Reports as briefing documents in Council meeting documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Communication and process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clearly defined committee roles ▪ Regularly schedule calls with all chairs (webinars that perhaps can be archived)? ▪ Co-chairs are WG members ▪ Are co-chairs communicating with the committee/subcommittee membership?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Work plans not consistently completed, implemented, and reported ▪ Accountability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Two-year work plans instead of one year so that there are less activities in the work plan ▪ Logic models so that you can focus the work and report on the results ▪ <i>Carrots</i> (connection with the structure is the biggest carrot) and <i>sticks</i> (no funding—not so much a motivation now)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Culture vs. technology or mechanics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Culture needs to change—technology can only facilitate a process; it isn't the solution

What would a new process look like?

- Biennial work plans with opportunity to submit a revision after one year (if needed but not required)
- Use current template for work plans
- Use work plans to facilitate internal communication and integration (in narrative section)
- Incorporate prioritization for each activity and linkages (steps to show how one activity is necessary to get to another) to other activities within and without the committee so that the two-year plan will be shorter
- Annual reporting on measures and outcomes—a short report and would be included in the Council briefing packet with the possibility grant charts for timeline reporting
- Dynamic and online entry/query/reporting form on gulfmaine.org (can the Secretariat Team / Management and Finance discuss this option?)

Developing Recommendations to Implement the Council's Evaluation Methodology

Ann Rodney and Adrienne Harrison

Action: Ann will send to Michele the evaluation documents for her to post on gulfmaine.org.

Action: Evaluation recommendations, including bridge outcomes, will be added to the June WG and Council June meeting agendas.



Reviewing what the Council and Working Group needs to do and how best to get this work done: Council and Working Group meeting schedules

<i>Option</i>	<i>Pro</i>	<i>Con</i>
Coming to meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Get to see each other/face time ▪ Extra-curricular time is very productive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cost ▪ Time
Same meeting schedule but add calls every month	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More buy-in and momentum between meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More time for participants
Calls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Involves those who cannot be there 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No face time ▪ Inattention or focus
Webinar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provides those who cannot be there with a view of slides and other electronic media presented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No face time ▪ Inattention or focus ▪ Costs (could be free)

Comments

- The reason for the GOMC is communication
- Let's not choose an option that sends the GOMC into a downward spiral
- The Working Group meeting four times each year is essential and keeps momentum going
- Travel days could be better spent on actual work
- There is a time crisis as well as a financial crisis
- The Council needs to meet more frequently—webinars and telephone calls in between the semi-annual meetings?
- One Councilor would have come if the travel could have been justified with a longer meeting (1.5 days instead of 1 day)
- There's so little face time with no forum and one day meetings—it's easier for Councilors to miss a little (one day) than to miss a lot (two days) Have meetings at just two places instead of rotating, St Andrews, for instance?
- Have meetings at places that are easy for air or other travel
- Make sure that meeting logistics don't require extra investment in administrative time
- Three WG meetings (face-to-face) with October/fall meeting as a webinar or call, and then two Council meetings
- The Secretariat jurisdiction could receive help to set up the "more frequent" meetings
- Piggy back GOMC meetings on to other meetings such as NROC (or vice-versa) to leverage travel time
- Semi-annual Council meetings must still be in conjunction with WG meetings
- Secretariat hosting is a source of pride, hospitality, and good will
- Make conference call or webinar services: USGS, NOAA, and EPA are willing to provide their toll-free webinar service (Michele/naturesource communications/TKG is willing to provide at no charge a toll webinar service)
- Having roles for each person on the agenda so that WG members and Councilors can justify their travel
- Scheduling the meetings' times of day is key to facilitate the least number of overnight travel costs

Action: The NS Secretariat will propose the WG dates in the last two weeks of March meeting in Portsmouth, NH or perhaps Gloucester.

Action: The M&F will discuss setting WG and Council meetings two years in advance with saved dates that are subject to change.



Habitat Monitoring Subcommittee

Update

- HMSC co-chairs organized a regional conference on "Status, Trends, and Conservation of Eelgrass in Atlantic Canada and the Northeastern United States", held February 24-25, 2009, in Portland, ME. About 100 participants were in attendance representing all sectors involved in eelgrass conservation on both sides of the border – research institutions; federal, state, and provincial agencies with habitat protection and permitting responsibilities; local zoning and natural-resource decision makers; consulting firms; and regional and local nongovernmental conservation organizations. Presentations focused on the wide range of issues surrounding eelgrass conservation, including causes for changes in eelgrass status around the region, protecting habitat functions and values from direct impacts, setting nutrient and habitat criteria, emerging issues such as invasive species and climate change, and programs and partnerships for conservation. Presentations and discussions brought science to bear on management issues. Participants reported that the workshop left them more informed about approaches to eelgrass conservation and energized to implement various conservation measures.
- HMSC has developed a pilot web-based data system to enable the regional sharing, integration, and use of coastal habitat data. The pilot includes online entry, centralized storage, and synthesis and graphical display of limited data types (salt marsh and seagrass vegetation monitoring data). We are working to expand the pilot to include additional variables that form Gulf of Maine habitat monitoring protocols. We have received input on needs for data integration from a small group of end users representing various sectors involved in habitat monitoring. This information will help us develop proposals to complete this web-based tool in a way that targets the needs of end users.

Next steps

- HMSC Co-chairs are synthesizing the eelgrass workshop results into a short summary document. We plan to make the workshop program, presentation abstracts and slide shows, and workshop summary available online. Ideally we would like to post this material on the GOMC\Habitat Monitoring web site.
- Co-chairs will continue to seek support for database development needed to complete the web-based data system.

Submitted by Hilary Neckles and Al Hanson, Habitat Monitoring Subcommittee Co-chairs.



NOAA Marine Spatial Planning Tools: Multipurpose Marine Cadastre and Legislative Atlas

NOAA's Coastal Services Center (CSC) is designing products and tools to assist with marine spatial planning efforts around the U.S. The Multipurpose Marine Cadastre (MMC) is a marine information system for the outer continental shelf (OCS) and state waters that supports decision making related to alternative energy uses and resource management. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 requested the Mineral Management Service (MMS) and NOAA develop a decision-support tool for ocean energy facility siting. CSC has provided technical services to MMS by developing the framework for the MMC. MMS has provided funding and lessons learned from past ocean energy project proposals. A new website focused on domestic case studies will be launched in May of this year.

The Legislative Atlas displays and summarizes coastal management laws. CSC has just completed the data viewer for state laws in the Gulf of Maine. The Legislative Atlas allows users to visualize where selected coastal and ocean laws apply helping regional collaborations (like the GOMC and NROC) understand state and federal jurisdictions.

CSC is interested in documenting user experiences or case studies for both tools in the Gulf of Maine.

Submitted by Adrienne Harrison and Betsy Nicholson, NOAA Coastal Services Center, NROC Executive Committee members



Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment
Aligning Council Activities with Councilor Interests
March 9, 2009

Note: In preparing the Council's 2009-2010 work plan it is timely to determine Councilor interests in the work plan and identify how they can assist with one or more tasks. They could be viewed by their colleagues as the lead on a particular task or one of a number of Councilors that want to work collaboratively on a task. Ideally each Councilor will be actively in one or more tasks.

GOMC Activity	Potential Councilor Involvement and Ambassador Roles in 2009-2010
GOM Mapping Initiative	Pat Kurkul, Michael Murphy & Rob Stephenson/– Assist in articulating the need for seafloor maps and assist Coordinator make connections at the federal level
Habitat Conservation	Jen Smith – Help define committee purpose and recruit Canadian participants
Habitat Monitoring	
Habitat Restoration	
Gulfwatch	Greg Roach – Help to ensure Gulfwatch remains active and vital
Climate Change	
Ecosystem Indicators	Priscilla Brooks, Jackie Olsen – Help to articulate the value and application of indicators of ecosystem health
Outreach, Public Relations, and Awards	Jamie Geiger/Susan Russell Robinson – Provide outreach support services in creating and distributing releases and notices; Carolyn Gravel – Assist with the Sustainable Industry Awards initiative;
Information Technology	
Secretariat operations	Michael Walls – Serve as Chairman of the Council
Fund development	Peter Lamb & Jack Wiggin – work collaboratively with Fund Development contractor to develop funding approaches and identify funding opportunities
Gulf of Maine Times	
Action Plan Grants	
USGOMA	Don Hudson – perform duties of the President of the Association
Formal Liaison with other organizations	John Annala and Rob Stephenson – Represent Council interests with RARGOM and BoFEP 2009 annual conferences.
Industry collaboration	Carolyn Gravel – Assist the SICC in the annual awards

Submitted by: the Secretariat Team



Councilors

- Mr John A. Annala
Director, Gulf of Maine Research
Institute
- Mr Deerin Babb-Brott
Director, MA Office of Coastal Zone
Management
- Dr. Priscilla M. Brooks
Director, Marine Resources Project,
Conservation Law Foundation
- Mr. Thomas S Burack
Commissioner, NH Department of
Environmental Services
- Mr Ron Chisholm
Minister, NS Fisheries and Aquaculture
- Mr Rick Doucet
Minister, NB Department of Fisheries
- Ms. Martha Freeman
Director, Maine State Planning Office
- Ms Carolyn Gravel
Manager, Environmental Affairs,
Shipping Federation of Canada
- Mr Douglas Grout
Chief, Division of Marine Fisheries, NH
Fish and Game Department
- Mr Roland Hache
Minster, NB Department of Environment
- Dr. W. Donald Hudson
President, The Chewonki Foundation
- Ms. Patricia A. Kurkul
Regional Administrator, NOAA/NMFS
- Mr. Peter F. Lamb
Senior Philanthropic Advisor, New
Hampshire Charitable Foundation
- Mr. George D. Lapointe
Commissioner, Maine Department of
Marine Resources
- Mr Jim MacKay
Deputy Minister, NH Department of
Fisheries
- Mr Marvin Moriarty
Regional Director, US Fish and Wildlife
Service
- Mr David Morse
Minister, NS Department of Environment
- Mr. Michael Murphy
Regional Director, Oceans and Habitat
Branch, Fisheries and Oceans Canada
- Ms Jackie Olsen
Environment Canada
- Mr Stephen Perkins
Director, Office of Ecosystem
Protection, US Environmental Protection
Agency
- Ms Jennifer Smith
Manager, GIS/Conservation Planning,
WWF-Canada Atlantic Program
- Ms. Lee Sochasky
Executive Director, St. Croix
International Waterway Commission
- Dr Robert L Stephenson
Director, DFO St. Andrews Biological
Station
- Mr Greg Thompson
Fundy North Fishermen's Association
- Mr Jack Wiggin
Director, Urban Harbors Institute

BOFEP and RARGOM science events: GOMC participation and support

In December '08, the Working Group and Council discussed ways to foster linkages between Council and the BoFEP and RARGOM science events. It was envisioned that this might include: presentations, displays, piggy-backed sessions, or other events.

Since December, a number of linkages have developed which are summarized below. As well, at the request of the Secretariat, opportunities for greater Council involvement were suggested by RARGOM members and Councilors Rob Stephenson and John Annala, and the BOFEP lead Peter Wells. Given Council's current capacity and financial situation, the Working Group needs to discuss the capacity and leads for participation in the upcoming BOFEP and RARGOM events.

Bay of Fundy Ecosystem Partnership (BOFEP)

8th Science Workshop: Resource Development and its Implications for the Bay of Fundy and Gulf of Maine

May 25-29, 2009

Acadia Centre for Estuarine Research, Acadia University, Wolfville, Nova Scotia

www.bofep.org/workshop2009

The biennial BOFEP Science Workshops provide an opportunity to present research papers, reviews, viewpoint papers, posters and project demonstrations pertaining to the Bay of Fundy and Gulf of Maine region. The workshops are also an opportunity for BoFEP Partners to review the latest scientific findings, discuss pressing environmental issues and plan new research and conservation initiatives.

Current GOMC Participation

- ESIP will be hosting a session on state of the environment reporting
- Participation/Presentation by Al Hanson, Co-Chair, GOMC Habitat Monitoring Sub-Committee and Chair, BOFEP Eelgrass Committee

Suggestions for further GOMC participation

- Increased number of presentations by Council sub-committees
- Funding support and/or assistance in seeking funding

Regional Association for Research on the Gulf of Maine (RARGOM)

Gulf of Maine Symposium: Advancing Ecosystem Research for the Future of the Gulf

October 4-9, 2009

St. Andrews, New Brunswick

www.rargom.org/Symposium2009

The last RARGOM scientific symposium and workshop was held in St Andrews, New Brunswick in 1996. Since that date, there have been tremendous advances in our understanding of the Gulf of Maine, and federal, provincial, and state jurisdictions have moved forward with ecosystem approaches to management. Therefore, it is timely to review and update the last decade of policy approaches and science, and make recommendations on the knowledge required to move forward with an integrated, ecosystem approach to management in the Gulf of Maine.

Current GOMC participation:

- None specifically identified at this time

Suggestions for further GOMC participation:

- Council members or committees take the lead to develop and chair one or more of the concurrent sessions
- Submission of papers/posters from Council committees to help shape the theme sessions
- Encourage sponsorship from members of the Council

Submitted by: Justin Huston, WG Chair



Briefing Document for Summit Event to Celebrate the 20 years of the GOMC

Background:

There is an interest in hosting a follow up event to the Summit 2004. We have considered a multiday celebration that would be hosted by the GOMC together other partners. It was proposed that Theresa form a committee to plan and fundraise for this event. In the last Council meeting at which Theresa presented the idea and current plan of action there was a considerable level of concern on the amount of time and money that this effort would entail. It was suggested that further investigation into costs and possible partnerships be pursued.

Current Thoughts:

In review of the Council's response to the proposal for a GOMC Summit there seemed to be a possible way to achieve the various goals through a different and less resource draining event. As there is a growing effort to host World Ocean Day celebrations each June I would propose that the GOMC Outreach Committee coordinates with other Gulf of Maine based organizations a World Oceans Day event in Portland Maine June 2010. This could be a two day celebration of our special Gulf of Maine corner of the world ocean.

Through our Summit planning conversations most of Working Group and Council support the idea of celebrating the Gulf of Maine, and now the World Ocean, through a collaborative event including the arts, science, industrial and conservation communities. A component of this celebration would be focused on recognition of the great achievements of the GOMC and the future vision of the GOMC, possibly a release of highlights of the next 5 year Action Plan. We could plan the June Council meeting to coincide with this event to maximize the justification for travel for the Working Group and Council members.

What is being achieved by hosting a World Oceans Day event in lieu of a Gulf of Maine Council Summit is justifying a greater participation by other organizations in planning and implementing the event while still meeting GOMC objectives for a Summit style event. We can host concurrent activities, for example, media and special invite cocktail parties for our Councilors, to focus on and honor the work of the GOMC while putting our GOMC work in the context of conservation of our Ocean Planet!!

Directions Needed:

Does this meet the key objectives of the proposed Summit Event?

Does this address the primary concerns expressed by the Council?

Can we agree to direct Theresa and the Outreach Committee to move forward in framing up the proposed event and to identify key partners?

Submitted by Theresa Torrent-Ellis, Maine Coastal Program, Co-Chair Outreach Committee



Gulf of Maine Restoration & Protection Initiative

Briefing Paper for March 2009 Working Group Meeting

A Priceless Ecosystem at Risk

The Gulf of Maine—with its coastal shorelines of Maine, New Hampshire and Massachusetts—is vital to human health and the region's economy: millions of people depend on the Gulf of Maine watershed for food, recreation, transportation, and drinking water. It is a unique ecosystem, whose beauty and biological diversity enrich the lives of all who live, work and visit here. Yet each day, the Gulf of Maine watershed—its streams, lakes, bays, and beaches—are damaged by untreated sewage, toxic pollution, invasive species, loss of wildlife habitat, abandoned fishing gear and other human-caused impacts. The problems are serious and many of them, have reached or are reaching crisis proportions. There are manageable solutions—some already in various stages of implementation—but if we don't move quickly the problems will only get worse and the solutions more expensive.

A Comprehensive Strategy

The Gulf of Maine Restoration and Protection Initiative is a collaborative, public-private effort that is working to develop and implement a unified restoration strategy for the Gulf of Maine. This initiative parallels similar efforts for the Great Lakes, Chesapeake Bay, Everglades, Louisiana Coast, Puget Sound, and other major ecosystems. Although there is already excellent restoration and protection work underway in the Gulf of Maine by hundreds of non-governmental organizations and local, state, and federal agencies, the region suffers from the lack of a comprehensive and coordinated restoration strategy. Currently, for example, there is no one source of information that describes the hundreds of efforts underway around the Gulf of Maine, nor a compilation of restoration priorities. The first task, therefore, is to draw on the region's existing programs and restoration plans and identify what other projects should be considered in a comprehensive strategy, as well as the costs and timeframes for those activities. Work on this is already under way with assistance from the Coastal Programs in Maine, New Hampshire and Massachusetts, the Gulf of Maine Council, the US Fish and Wildlife Service Gulf of Maine Coastal Program, National Wildlife Federation, and others.¹

Setting Restoration Priorities

Recognizing that it is unlikely that each proposed restoration project is feasible or cost-effective, the next step will be to set priorities. Following the model of the Great Lakes program, restoration priorities are likely to include 1) upgrading aging storm water and waste water treatment systems, 2) combating invasive species, 3) cleaning up toxic sediments in rivers and harbors, and 4) protecting and restoring wildlife habitat, including access for migratory fish. Other issues might include the removal of abandoned ("ghost") fishing gear, or abating nutrient loading in the marine environment due to rainwater runoff from agricultural and residential sources. The process of setting restoration priorities will be inclusive and will involve as many Gulf of Maine stakeholders as possible from government, business, civic groups, and non-profit conservation and environmental organizations.

Timeline

Work is already underway to collect information about ongoing and needed restoration programs, but it is a huge task that we expect will take months to complete. We hope to have collected most of the information this spring in time for a summit of stakeholders currently scheduled for June 5th in Portland. There is a possibility that we may be able to craft the final strategy at that meeting, but the process is likely to take longer. (In the Great Lakes the restoration strategy was developed by consensus, and the process took well over a year.) In any event, we hope to have a final draft of a Gulf of Maine Restoration and Protection Strategy by December 2009.

1 Key Contacts: For more information about this initiative, or to suggest projects for the restoration strategy, or please contact Peter Alexander at Talking Conservation (peter@talkingconservation.org). Businesses, federal agencies, and non-governmental organizations interested in participating should contact Laurie Allen at National Wildlife Federation (AllenL@nwf.org).



Questions and Answers

1. What's the Council's role in all of this & how does it relate to the current habitat restoration strategy the Council is using (e.g., are we starting all over, how does it build on other plans and strategies, etc.)?

The “new” Gulf of Maine Ecosystem Restoration Initiative is intended to build on the good work already underway by numerous agencies and organizations active in the Gulf of Maine, bringing many diverse efforts and plans under a single “comprehensive plan” on a scale similar to what is already in place for other major aquatic ecosystems, including Great Lakes, Chesapeake Bay, Everglades, Louisiana Coast, and Puget Sound. The main benefit of such a plan is to ensure that Gulf of Maine gets equal consideration as federal funding for ecosystem restoration gets allocated. The Obama budget line item of \$475,000,000 for Great Lakes restoration provides a powerful example of the importance of having a comprehensive plan in place.

2. What is this "stakeholder meeting", what WG & Councilors are involved in its planning, and what is the desired outcome/results?

A June 5th meeting in Portland is planned for interested stakeholders to help shape this initiative. The Council should have a central role in this meeting, with a Council representative acting as “host” or “MC.” By taking the leadership role in this initiative the Council can help demonstrate that Gulf of Maine stakeholders are serious about creating a comprehensive plan—a factor that has been repeatedly cited by federal agencies and even NGOs as critical in any bid for consideration for inclusion in a national initiative such as EPA’s “Large Aquatic Ecosystem” program or the National Wildlife Federation’s emerging “Great Waters” initiative.

3. What does the Council need to do at their June meeting in Halifax & what advice should the WG provide to them leading up to that meeting?

As in other bi-national aquatic ecosystems, including the Great Lakes and Puget Sound, parallel strategies need to be initiated on each side of the border. At the June Council meeting the Council should formally adopt and endorse the initiative, determine what funding and staff support can be allocated to it, and discuss how a Canadian counterpart can be initiated, supported, and/or integrated with the US side.

4. Is this thing "real"? Will the region really see increased funding? What needs to be done to increase likelihood of positive results?

This initiative is as real as the participants care to make it, as demonstrated by their participation and commitment of resources to it. The stakes for increased funding are high, with many large ecosystems already far ahead of the Gulf of Maine on the agendas of federal agencies and the US Congress. With the example and experience of the Great Lakes (arguably the most successful and advanced of these initiatives) the process can be streamlined for the Gulf of Maine—and just the fact that leadership in the region is committed to developing a plan will help ensure that Gulf of Maine does not get left out (especially given the importance of Maine’s two Senators in the current configuration of the Senate).

The real work of developing the initiative will be two stages. The first, and probably the most difficult, is to collect data about restoration projects that are underway, those that are planned, and those that are still needed—along with cost estimates for all of them (in the three US Gulf of Maine states). The second stage will be to collectively set priorities and refine the data and include it in a cohesive strategy document similar to the “Great Lakes Regional Collaboration Strategy”, the restoration plan that has provided focus for legislation and appropriations for the Great Lakes.

Submitted by: David Keeley, TKG; Peter Alexander, Talking Conservation

Council Development Priorities: July 2008 to March 2009 progress in securing funding & support

Background: In June, 2008 the Council affirmed the following development priorities: restoration, ESIP, GOMMI, GOM Times, Action Plan Grants, Habitat Monitoring, Climate Change, Gulfwatch and the Summit/10-year celebration. Over the past nine-months the Development Coordinator has worked closely with committee and Working Group members to hone project ideas, identify funding opportunities, write proposals and conduct the required follow-up. *In all cases it required a team effort.*

Observations:

1. During this period it became clear that at least three things affect the success of the Council in securing the funding it needs: a compelling and competitive idea for a proposal, increased competition for discretionary dollars by other agencies and non-profits as the economy weakens, and the amount of time committee and Working Group members have to contribute to the development process.
2. The Council's development effort has pursued at least four methods to securing funds. Using a baseball analogy they include:
 - The long ball – These include two requests to Congress for \$500K and \$6.9M to support a range of Council priorities. We are also petitioning to be included in the EPA Strategic Plan as a “large aquatic ecosystem” and thus enabling funding and staff time to support the Council's objectives.
 - A Double – These are requests for ongoing support such as GOM Times readers becoming donors or sponsors that contribute each year.
 - A Single – These are one-time requests to foundations to support specific projects.
 - A Bunt – These are small requests (e.g., \$500 to \$5000) for such items as the GOMMI workshop on MPA closure effectiveness and the GOM Times.
3. Funders are interested in highly collaborative projects involving multiple partners that share risk with other funders and strengthen the likelihood of project success. Consequently the development/incubation time for these proposals is longer than a stand alone proposal.
4. Committee and Working Group members, familiar with the content of Council priorities, are in the best position to identify funding prospects and government Requests for Proposals.

Outputs and Results (see Development Notebook at March WG meeting for details)

- ❖ Thirteen proposals were written and submitted requesting nearly \$400,000
- ❖ Two Congressional requests were developed and submitted requesting \$6,500,000. (Implementation strategies involving the governors via the New England Governor's Conference, Councilors and Working Group members are being pursued.)
- ❖ GOM Times donor and sponsor mechanisms were established and collected \$3,000. (Agencies have offered an additional \$10,000.)
- ❖ Five proposals, including the Congressional requests, that total \$6.7M are awaiting a funders response
- ❖ Six proposals were funded for \$60,000
- ❖ In nine-months the Council has raised \$73,500 in cash in support of its priorities

Submitted by: David Keeley, TKG



Recommendations for migrating to an “all electronic format” for the *Gulf of Maine Times*

Background: The Council has produced the *Gulf of Maine Times* for nearly 15-years at a cost of \$20,000/edition. These costs include expenses for the editor, contributing writers, layout for print and electronic versions, and printing and mailing. Approximately one-half of the cost for each edition is for printing and mailing.

In 2008, the Council assessed the *Gulf of Maine Times* and produced the report, *Recommendations for a new approach for changing times*. The report analyzes the purpose of the *Times*, target audiences, and optimum content. The report outlines a number of publishing scenarios and provides comparisons of the various options. Numerous ways of generating revenue are included. The report concludes with recommendations for immediate next steps.

Status: The Council accepted the report and commenced work on securing donors and sponsors as one funding strategy. Fifteen promising sponsor prospects were identified, personalized letters were sent, and follow-up discussions were organized. To date, no organizations have offered to sponsor the *Times*. Commencing with the December 2008 edition, the *Times* encouraged readers to make charitable donations to support the newspaper via a secure web site or by sending a check. To date, about 20 individuals have made donations totaling \$3,000.

Recommendations for producing solely a online edition: Given economic conditions, it is essential to determine how the Council can effectively migrate to solely a web-based version of the *Times*. The following recommendations are provided by The Keeley Group team for consideration by the Working Group and the GOMT Editorial Board.

1. March 2009 is the final dual print/web edition – Absent significant and ongoing donations by Council member agencies, the March 2009 edition will be the final print and web edition of the *Times*.
2. Flagship publication should continue – Production of the *Times* should continue at a lower annual cost (e.g., \$10,000/edition) by migrating solely to an electronic format.
3. Revenue sources for the *Times* – It is reasonable to assume that \$7,000 per year can be raised from donors, \$3,000 from sponsors, \$10,000 from special appeals to Council member agencies, and \$5,000 for issue-based articles from foundations/businesses/agencies. Securing this level of funding would support production and posting of two web-based editions of the *Times* per year.
4. Methods to promote the *Times* and increase circulation – The Council should set a goal of 15,000 readers and aggressively market the *Times* to current subscriber and target others. Key techniques should include asking Council member agencies, marine trade organizations and associations, and sub-regional organizations with mutual interests (e.g., NROC, NERACOOS, BoFEP, RARGOM, GOMODP, ACZISC, GOM Ocean Science Council, ACAP, NEP, etc.) to promote the “free, web-based *Times*” to their patrons and colleagues.
5. Anticipated bi-annual product – The appearance of the e-version of the *Times* should remain unchanged from the current approach (e.g., masthead, newspaper format, color, articles, book reviews, etc.).
6. What is the Council buying – A budget of \$10,000 per edition would support an editor, contributing writers, layout and posting of a web-based edition, and two web updates between issues with a smaller selection of stories, book reviews, resources, etc.

The Working Group should consider this matter, discuss ways to lever Council member agency contributions, and prepare their recommendation for consideration by the Council in June.

Submitted by: TKG

Talking Conservation

Addressing the Conservation Community's Urgent Need For Communication Resources

The Challenge

Of the many conservation and environmental organizations doing good work in the Gulf of Maine region very few have access to some of the most basic tools and resources needed for effective communications and outreach. Decades without access to public opinion research—research that can identify ways of reaching and motivating new audiences—has rendered many environmental groups capable of little more than preaching to the choir. Many organizations default to the use of tactics (printing a brochure or putting up a website) without strategic consideration of who the intended audience is or what action or behavior is desired as an outcome.

The success of every organizational and program goal depends on **good communications**. Politicians and businesses understand this, and spend enormous amounts of money on research to figure out how to get their targeted audiences to take action—whether to buy a product or cast a vote. If conservation organizations were given tools and resources that inform effective communication, they could employ more strategic and more effective approaches to their communications and outreach. For example, when the Cape Elizabeth Land Trust utilized research conducted for them in 2006 by Critical Insights (Portland) to inform the way they engaged with key audiences about their mission and their work, the organization was able to boost its paying membership by nearly 100%—from 350 to 650 members.

Example of A Good Solution—with lots of extra benefits

One of the best examples of the use of effective communication tools and strategies by conservation groups comes from the Great Lakes region. During the last four years a giant coalition has been seeking federal funding to restore the ecosystems of the Great Lakes. The coalition, led by the National Wildlife Federation and the National Parks Conservation Association, is funded mainly by a private Michigan foundation that committed \$5 million over five years so the coalition could advocate for procurement of federal appropriations. To ensure that the coalition developed an effective communication strategy in support of its political objectives, the Joyce Foundation of Chicago provided a \$550,000 grant that was used to conduct public opinion research, develop messages, fact sheets, message kits, and other materials, and—most importantly—to train the 100+ coalition member organizations in how to use these invaluable resources. Some of the benefits of the campaign have included:

- Most participating organizations are now talking with one voice and “branding” the Lakes in the same way.
- Now that they have access to research, training, and other resources, many of the conservation and environmental groups (from Chicago’s Shedd Aquarium to the Ohio Environmental Council) have dramatically changed the way they think about and carry out their own communications and outreach. They are much more strategic and are reaching *and motivating new audiences*.
- The restoration campaign, framed as a “win-win” for all, has brought together in common cause organizations that have historically competed, disagreed, or even openly fought against each other. The coalition includes chambers of commerce, zoos and aquariums, hunting and fishing organizations, and business groups, as well as environmental and conservation organizations.
- Although the omnibus bill that the coalition got introduced has not passed in Congress, many of its component parts have been taken up and funded, or partially funded through other legislation. The net increase in appropriations for Great Lakes restoration projects that can be directly attributed to the coalition’s advocacy is estimated at \$200 million—already a very satisfactory return on the \$5 million philanthropic investment that funded the coalition.

Multiple Opportunities for the Gulf of Maine

Even without a shared advocacy campaign like the one for Great Lakes Restoration there would be enormous benefits gained by providing public opinion research, training, and other resources to the conservation and environmental organizations working in the Gulf of Maine. Such resources would greatly enhance each participating organization’s effectiveness and would provide a vehicle for improved inter-organizational communication and cooperation.



But conditions are also now ripe for an initiative modeled after the Great Lakes restoration strategy. Currently there are several pieces of legislation pending in Congress to restore various ecosystems, including the Chesapeake Bay, Everglades, Gulf Coast, Mississippi River, Puget Sound, and the Great Lakes. Each of these initiatives has—or is seeking—federal support, and there is now talk in Washington of combining them into a single “Great Waters” program. Numerous state and federal agencies and NGO’s in Maine, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts are aware of this opportunity and are already working together to ensure that the Gulf of Maine is included in any such national program. These developments add urgency to the need for the improved communications capacity that this program would facilitate for the partnering organizations.

Dozens of Organizations Already Engaged

With support from the Maine Coastal Program and the US Fish and Wildlife Service Gulf of Maine Coastal Program, Peter Alexander, director of Talking Conservation, has already done a great deal of ground work on this program. In April 2007 he conducted presentations in Belfast and Portland to more than 50 attending organizations. Participants completed surveys to assess their organizations’ capacities and their need for a variety of communications resources and services. Nearly all participants indicated a very high need for targeted public opinion research that could help them understand and communicate more effectively with key audiences that weren’t already supporters or constituents.

Following up on the presentations, Talking Conservation recently conducted a series of meetings with 20+ of these organizations to determine what their specific research needs were. Participants were asked in advance to identify a couple of critical program or organizational goals and one or two specific audiences with whom their organization needed better communication in order to achieve those goals. Participants were also provided with the following explanatory statement:

Based on Target Audiences and Communication Goals identified by each participating organization, we plan to design research tools that will help us discover as much as we can about:

- 1) Audience values and concerns as they relate to your organization’s relevant program goals
 - a. Which values or concerns might be obstacles? (For example, some conservation-minded landowners might not want to cut any trees, even though good forest management sometimes calls for doing that).
 - b. Which values and concerns might be appealed to in order to gain that audience’s support? (For example, when presenting before a chamber of commerce, talking about the economic benefits of a project might carry more weight than talking about the environmental ones).
- 2) Media Pathways to each target audience (where do they get their information?)
- 3) Whom would each target audience trust as a “messenger”?
- 4) What terms and language would each target audience use as an alternative to “insider language” that is commonly used by conservation and environmental organizations (such as “sustainability”, “open space”, “ecosystem-based management”, etc.).

A Strategic Approach to Communications

It is interesting to note that many of the participating organizations were not used to thinking about organizational and program goals through the lens of “moving audiences to action,” and were unfamiliar with the concept of “understanding target audience values and concerns.” Many noted that linking organizational and program goals to communication goals was a new and helpful approach—and that understanding communications and outreach in this way clarified the importance and relevance of the kind of public opinion research anticipated by this initiative.

Needs Clearly Identified

As a result of these meetings, we now have a very clear idea of what kind of information would be helpful to each participating organization. For example, the Friends of Casco Bay identified two important audiences (coastal property owners in the Casco Bay, and upstream riparian property owners), one organizational goal (boosting paying membership), and two program goals (increasing awareness about the connection between land conservation and marine ecosystem health, and increasing the understanding of water quality as an essential component of wildlife habitat.) By understanding more about the values and concerns of coastal property owners (both summer and year-round residents)—as well as how these people get their information—Friends of Casco Bay, like the Cape Elizabeth Land Trust cited above, will be better positioned to boost paying membership; and by understanding more about upstream riparian landowners, the organization can do a more effective job of communicating about the importance of land stewardship for ensuring good down-stream water quality and a healthy marine ecosystem.



Audiences and Communications Needs are Cross Cutting

Although each of the organizations interviewed so far has its own geographical or program focus, many of them share target audiences, either geographically or demographically. For example, the Maine Department of Forestry identifies as its “primary target audience” the 100,000+ landowners statewide who own parcels from 10 to 1000 acres. Many of these landowners are also the primary target audience on a more local level for land trust organizations, and are also an important audience for the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife, as well as groups like Friends of Casco Bay that are working on environmental quality issues. Similarly, many of the organizations interviewed are interested in learning more about long-time (multi-generational) residents—“working local families”—and many are interested in reaching people engaged in outdoor recreation. In other words, it will be possible to design public opinion research efficiently to simultaneously meet the communication and outreach needs of numerous organizations.

Meeting notes summarizing each participating organizations’ goals and target audiences so far are included as Attachment B, and a table showing the intersections of audiences and issues is included as Attachment C. It should be noted that the organizations interviewed so far represent only about one third of the intended participants. Further, because of limited funding, those interviewed have mostly been located in Maine. When this program is properly funded we will interview at least 50 organizations with equivalent representation from New Hampshire and Massachusetts. We will also ensure that we have a good mix of public and private organizations (from NGO’s to state agencies) representing land conservation, marine conservation, and environmental protection.

Components of the Program

This program is not simply about conducting and making available public opinion research for conservation groups. It is about working with each individual organization, helping them as needed to think strategically about their communications and outreach, engaging them in the design of the research, and helping them utilize the research effectively. Since many conservation organizations are not familiar with the use of research to inform their work, it is not enough to just give it to them: most of them need some level of continuing assistance and advice. Less than half of the accompanying proposed budget is allocated for actual research. The majority of funds are to pay for expenses and staff time to work hand in hand with the fifty or more organizations expected to take part. Among the kinds of assistance that various organizations have already called for are:

- a) Review of existing communications and outreach materials
- b) Assistance developing a strategic communications and outreach plan
- c) Assistance designing “do it yourself” research such as visitor surveys, member interviews, etc.
- d) Assistance developing specific messages for target audiences
- e) Assistance networking with other organizations with similar communications needs and issues
- f) Training in the basics of strategic communication, including developing values-based messages
- g) Training in the interpretation and use of public opinion research

Key outcomes of this program, therefore, are dramatically increased *capacity* for effective communications by conservation organizations in the Gulf of Maine region, and a resulting increase in the value and impact of each organization’s work.

Next Steps

The top priority now is to procure funding to underwrite the continuation of this program. An outline of actual steps, including a two year budget, is presented in Attachment A (“Logic Model Overview”).



ATTACHMENT A

LOGIC MODEL OVERVIEW OF A SHARED COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT PROGRAM

Many foundations, universities, non-profits, and other organizations now utilize a “logic model” approach for program and organizational planning. The logic model starts by defining the intended “impacts” and “outcomes” of a program: defining “how the world is different” as a result of the program activities, and including ways of evaluating and measuring the program’s success. It then tracks backwards through all the component pieces of the plan, defining what materials and activities are needed, what partners should be involved, and what resources (money, staff time, expertise, etc.) are required to make it happen. This kind of strategic overview is extremely useful in planning communications programs, and has been used in creating the following outline of the communications resource and support program we envision with this proposal.

Long Term Project Impacts:

Individual behaviors, public policies, and business practices are aligned to support the restoration and preservation of the Gulf of Maine’s unique environment, culture, and quality of life.

Project Outcomes:

Organizations in the Gulf of Maine region that are working for environmental restoration and protection are armed with sophisticated communications tools, are working together with shared and/or coordinated messaging, and are successfully applying principles of strategic communications in all phases of their work—from building constituencies to changing behavior through social marketing.

Project Goals:

- 1) To provide partner organizations with targeted public opinion research that can help them identify and communicate more effectively with key audiences.
- 2) To build the internal communications capacity and staff skills as needed in each participating organization.
- 3) To facilitate greater collaboration and cooperation—including shared or coordinated messaging and communications strategies—among organizations and agencies working to protect and restore the Gulf of Maine.

Project Objectives

- 1) To engage partner organizations in planning a body of public opinion research that will be designed specifically to meet the collective and shared needs of the partners.
- 2) To retain a public opinion research firm to conduct the research.
- 3) To share the results of the research with all partnering organizations.
- 4) To assist each partner on an as-needed basis to ensure that the research is properly and strategically utilized in fulfilling their communications goals.

Project Activities

- 1) Partner organizations will be engaged in planning the research through a combination of:
 - a. Workshops
 - b. On Line and Hardcopy Surveys
 - c. One on One meetings with project staff
- 2) Research will be conducted by an independent firm, selected through a competitive RFP process.
- 3) Research results will be shared with partners through research briefings and written reports.
- 4) Assistance will be provided as needed through meetings and one-on-one consultations between project staff and partner organizations’ staff.

Project Timeline (Two Years)

- 1) First 9 months: meet with partners to plan research goals.
- 2) Months 10 - 16: write and propagate RFP, select research firm, conduct research, hold briefings.
- 3) Months 17 – 22: work with partners as needed to ensure application of research.
- 4) Months 23 – 24: conduct evaluation and draft final report with recommendations for the future.



Project Resource Requirements and Budget (two year budget)

1) Project Staff (consultants)	
a. Director (700 hrs/year @ \$75/hr)	\$105,000
b. Communications Consultants (2 @ 500 hrs/year @ \$50/hr)	100,000
c. Logistics Staff (400 hrs/year @ \$25/hr)	20,000
2) Public Opinion Research Firm	150,000
3) Meetings and Events (assumes 8 meetings @ \$1,500 ea.)	12,000
4) Travel & Lodging (assumes 5,000 miles, and 20 hotel nights @ \$100)	4,500
5) Contingencies	<u>5,000</u>
 Total Two-Year Budget:	 \$396,500

NOTES:

- 1) A key feature of this project is its economic efficiency. Very few individual organizations can afford public opinion research and the other services and resources anticipated here—but by sharing those costs among 50 or more organizations, all can benefit at a low per-organization cost. The total budget represents an allocation of only about \$4,000 per year, per organization.
- 2) In order to avoid administrative and overhead costs, Talking Conservation proposes this program as a contract, not a grant. If it were to be reconfigured as a grant-funded program, administrative and overhead costs for the fiscal agent would need to be added.



ATTACHMENT B

Meeting Notes Public Opinion Research Planning

Based on Target Audiences and Communication Goals identified by each participating organization, we plan to design research tools that will help us discover as much as we can about:

- 1) Audience values and concerns as they relate to each participating organization's relevant program goals
 - a. Which ones might be obstacles? (for example, some conservation-minded land owners might not want to cut a tree, even though good forest management sometimes calls for doing that)
 - b. Which ones might be appealed to in order to gain that audience's support? (for example, talking about the economic benefits of a project might carry more weight than talking about the environmental ones)
- 2) Media Pathways to each target audience (where do they get their information?)
- 3) Whom each target audience would trust as a "messenger"
- 4) What terms and language each target audience would use as an alternative to "insider language" that is commonly used by conservation and environmental organizations (such as "sustainability", "open space", "ecosystem-based management", etc.)

Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife

Target audience:

- a) Non-paying users of IFW resources, and beneficiaries of IFW programs:
 - a. Hikers
 - b. Birders
 - c. Kayakers
 - d. Cross country skiers
 - e. Backyard bird feeders
- b) Local/municipal policy makers

Communication Goals:

- a) How to reach non-paying users and convey to them the value of IFW's work so that they will support the agency in various ways (buying merchandise, license plates, etc.)
- b) How to communicate effectively (find the right terminology) with local policy makers and enforcement officers to ensure implementation and enforcement of good policy
- c) How to convey to policy makers the value of the tools and resources IFW has to offer

Maine Department of Forestry

Primary target audience: 100,000+ property owners statewide with lots of 10 – 1,000 acres.

Communication goal: Get them to appreciate the benefits of good forest management, and to recognize and use the resources available to them through our department.

Issue/Challenge: Many owners of this size range of property are not using it for economic purposes (no logging) and are, in fact, opposed to cutting a tree. However, the forest is, in many cases, past its maturity and in need of management.

Portland Water District

Audiences:

- a) Recreational users of Sebago lake
- b) Property Owners bordering or close to Sebago Lake and its tributaries
- c) Town officials (decision-makers and enforcement officers)



Communication Goals:

- a) Convince users of Sebago Lake to respect the water and keep it clean
 - a. Ice fishers
 - b. Boaters
 - c. Fishermen
- b) Educate nearby property owners about reducing runoff of yard chemicals
- c) Get town officials to ensure proper and uniform enforcement.
- d) Get "90/10" policy implemented (make lower 10% of Sebago Lake off limits for all recreational purposes to ensure clean drinking water).

Maine Coast Heritage Trust

Audiences:

- a) Working local families (people who have lived here all their lives) along entire coast
- b) People in suburban communities throughout Maine

Communication Goals

- a) Get working local families to understand how our work improves their lives
- b) Get suburban families to appreciate and support our work.

Lower Kennebec Regional Land Trust

Target Audiences:

- a) Local land owners (family heritage lands—not wealthy, well-educated, recent arrivals)
- b) Users of the working waterfront (clammers, fishermen, etc.)
- c) Municipal policy-makers

Communication goals:

- a) Get local property owners to understand the value, benefits, and uses of conserved land
- b) Get users of working waterfront to see their economic well-being as tied to conserved land—off-setting the negative impacts of development on water, shore, and shellfish.
- c) Get Municipal policy people to see Land Trusts as partners for planning, economic development, etc.

Coastal Mountains Land Trust

Target Audiences

- a) Family heritage land owners of inland and less affluent towns
- b) Younger families from existing membership demographic base (well-educated, affluent)

Communication goals:

- a) Can we get locals (family heritage landowners) to value and appreciate the work of our organization?
- b) Can we get them to volunteer
 - a. on special projects such as clearing trails for community use?
 - b. To monitor easements?
 - c. To offer special skills such as carpentry?
- c) Can we recruit younger audiences (families with children) as members and users of Land Trust services?

Friends of the Casco Bay

Target Audiences:

- a) Coastal property owners
 - i. Summer residents
 - ii. Working waterfront
- b) Inland riparian property owners

Communication Goals:

- 2) How can we talk about our work in a way that gets people excited and engaged enough that they will support the organization (the way MPBN members support public radio)?
- 3) How can we translate Land Conservation awareness into Water (marine) Conservation awareness?
- 4) How can we convey that water—the water column—is itself habitat, and that water quality is fundamental to everything in the ecosystem?



Gulf of Maine Census of Marine Life

Primary Audience: Bi-national local, state, and federal policy makers

Primary message: "We need a long term management plan based on good science to ensure the sustained health of the Gulf of Maine ecosystem."

Other Audiences:

- a) Fishermen
 - a. Commercial
 - b. Recreational
- b) Marina owners
- c) Ocean Commerce (ferries, shipping)
- d) Yacht Owners
- e) Riparian and Coastal Property Owners

Communication Goal:

Educate about health of marine environment and what they can do to make a difference.

Maine Sea Grant

Maine Sea Grant Marine Extension Team primary audiences

Commercial fishermen (including aquaculturists)

Municipal officials

Maine residents, including coastal property owners, and visitors

Messages

Maine Sea Grant is a source for factual, unbiased information about marine resources and coastal environments, as well as a source for management and planning tools and facilitation services.

There are benefits to working together to sustainably protect, manage, and develop Maine's coastal resources.

Engaging citizens in community planning efforts through appropriate and meaningful approaches produces better decisions and better citizens.

Challenges

Science-based information can be complex, uncertain, and difficult to comprehend, yet in many cases public health, resource sustainability, and economic stability are at stake.

Audience is widely distributed across the state. Many work non-standard schedules (need to communicate at night, weekends, etc., and not everyone communicates electronically). What are the right media to reach residents, especially those people who are not already engaged or "in the loop" (press notices, radio advertising, networking).

Understanding audience demographics, for example, who visits Maine's beaches? Municipalities lack the staff, financial resources, expertise and information needed to implement effective public participation processes. Coastal property owners view government at federal and state levels as a barrier to taking action.

Finally, how do we know if and when we have reached our target audiences?

Seacoast Science Center

Audience:

- a. Day Trippers from Massachusetts
- b. "GeoTourists"
- c. Families (with children) looking for educational entertainment
- d. Residents of retirement housing
- e. Church groups
- f. Our own visitors

Communication Goals:



- a. Why do people come to visit us? (can we use those reasons in reaching out to our target audiences?)
- b. Why do people become members and provide other support? (Can we use that information to increase the level and breadth of support and membership?)
- c. What are the things that people think are important (or urgent) about the Gulf of Maine; ie, what do they know, why do they care, and how can they be activated to care more and take action?

York Land Trust

Important Message: IF&W needs more funding in order to properly manage their resources

Audiences:

- a) Clam Diggers
- b) Septic System installers
- c) Riparian Land Owners (also urban)
- d) Landscape Maintenance providers

(We have many other audiences that we also want to work with, such as engineers, planners, and local officials working on "Low Impact Development" techniques to reduce stormwater impact of development.)

Communication Goals:

- a) Recruit clam diggers as information gatherers and advocates
- b) Work with septic installers so that systems are installed and maintained correctly-- they are an important avenue of communication to landowners about proper use and maintenance of septic systems as well.
- c) Educate riparian land owners about the impacts of vegetation, chemical applications, asphalt and other aspects of landscape design so that they modify their behavior in ways to protect the water resource.
- d) Educate Landscape service providers so they design landscapes and apply chemicals in ways to protect the water resource (and educate their customers.)



ATTACHMENT C

Organization	Target Audience(s)	Communication Goal	Comments
Maine Dept of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife	Non-paying users of IFW resources, and beneficiaries of IFW programs: (Hikers, Birders, Kayakers, Cross country skiers, Backyard bird feeders)	How to reach non-paying users and convey to them the value of IFW's work so that they will support the agency in various ways (buying merchandise, license plates, etc.)	Few people know that IF&W is responsible for the comeback of Maine's eagles, and other wildlife success stories
	Local/municipal policy makers	How to communicate effectively (find the right terminology) with local policy makers and enforcement officers to ensure implementation and enforcement of good policy How to convey to policy makers the value of the tools and resources IFW has to offer	
Maine Dept. of Forestry	100,000+ property owners statewide with lots of 10 – 1,000 acres.	Get them to appreciate the benefits of good forest management, and to recognize and use the resources available to them through our department.	Many owners of this size range of property are not using it for economic purposes (no logging) and are, in fact, opposed to cutting a tree. However, the forest is, in many cases, past its maturity and in need of management
Portland Water District	Recreational users of Sebago Lake	Convince users of Sebago Lake to respect the water and keep it clean (Ice fishers, Boaters, Fishermen)	
	Property Owners bordering or close to Sebago Lake and its tributaries	Educate nearby property owners about reducing runoff of yard chemicals	
	Town officials (decision-makers and enforcement officers)	Get town officials to ensure proper and uniform enforcement.	Get "90/10" policy implemented (make lower 10% of Sebago Lake off limits for all recreational purposes to ensure clean drinking water).
Maine Coast Heritage Trust	Working local families (people who have lived here all their lives) along entire coast	Get working local families to understand how our work improves their lives	Some "locals" view land trusts as "elitist"
	People in suburban communities throughout Maine	Get suburban families to appreciate and support our work.	Younger families with children are under-represented as members



Lower Kennebec Regional Land Trust	Local land owners (family heritage lands—not wealthy, well-educated, recent arrivals)	Get local property owners to understand the value, benefits, and uses of conserved land	
	Users of the working waterfront (clammers, fishermen, etc.)	Get users of working waterfront to see their economic well-being as tied to conserved land—off-setting the negative impacts of development on water, shore, and shellfish.	
	Municipal policy-makers	Get Municipal policy people to see Land Trusts as partners for planning, economic development, etc.	
Coastal Mountains Land Trust (Camden)	Family heritage land owners of inland and less affluent towns	Can we get locals (family heritage landowners) to value and appreciate the work of our organization? Can we get them to volunteer on special projects such as clearing trails for community use, monitoring easements, or offering special skills such as carpentry?	
	Younger families from existing membership demographic base (well-educated, affluent)	Can we recruit younger audiences (families with children) as members and users of Land Trust services?	
Friends of Casco Bay	Coastal property owners (Summer residents & Working waterfront)	How can we talk about our work to get people engaged enough that they will support us?	
	Inland riparian property owners	How can we translate Land Conservation awareness into Water (marine) Conservation awareness? How can we convey that water—the water column—is itself habitat, and that water quality is fundamental to everything in the ecosystem?	
Gulf of Maine Census of Marine Life	Bi-national local, state, and federal policy makers	Convey that “We need a long term management plan based on good science to ensure the sustained health of the Gulf of Maine ecosystem.”	
	Users of the Marine and Coastal	Educate about health of	



	environment	marine environment and what they can do to make a difference	
Maine Sea Grant	Commercial fishermen (including aquaculturists)	There are benefits to working together to sustainably protect, manage, and develop Maine's coastal resources.	Coastal property owners view government at federal and state levels as a barrier to taking action.
	Municipal officials	Maine Sea Grant is a source for factual, unbiased information about marine resources and coastal environments, as well as a source for management and planning tools and facilitation services.	Science-based information can be complex, uncertain, and difficult to comprehend, yet in many cases public health, resource sustainability, and economic stability are at stake.
	Maine residents, including coastal property owners, and visitors	Engaging citizens in community planning efforts through appropriate and meaningful approaches produces better decisions and better citizens.	Audience is widely distributed across the state. Many work non-standard schedules. What are the right media to reach people who are not already engaged?
Seacoast Science Center	Day Trippers from Massachusetts, "GeoTourists", Families (with children) looking for educational entertainment, Residents of retirement housing, Church groups, Our own visitors	Why do people come to visit us? Why do people become members and provide other support? What are the things that people think are important (or urgent) about the Gulf of Maine; ie, what do they know, why do they care, and how can they be activated to care more and take action?	
York Land Trust	Clam Diggers	Recruit clam diggers as information gatherers and advocates	
	Septic System installers	Work with septic installers so that systems are installed and maintained correctly--they are an important avenue of communication to landowners about proper use and maintenance of septic systems as well.	



	Riparian Land Owners (also urban)	Educate riparian land owners about the impacts of vegetation, chemical applications, asphalt and other aspects of landscape design so that they modify their behavior in ways to protect the water resource.	
	Landscape Maintenance providers	Educate Landscape service providers so they design landscapes and apply chemicals in ways to protect the water resource (and educate their customers.)	



US Gulf of Maine Association

PO Box 2246
South Portland, ME 04106

Inkind Donations Form

Description

Time in hours

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Value in Dollars

Travel (taxi, tolls, gas, hotel, flight etc)	_____
Meals	_____
Facility Rental	_____
Office Supplies	_____
Telephone	_____
Printing & Copying	_____
Postage	_____
Other (please describe)_____	_____

Organization Name:_____

Date_____

Address:_____

City, State & Zip_____

Signature_____

Printed Name_____