



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

Working Group Briefing Packet • V.3

Fredericton, NB • June 5-6, 2012



Table of Contents

Working Group June 2012 meeting agenda.....2

Working Group meeting summary.....5

New Council letterhead recommendations to the Council.....15

Gulf of Maine Association Update16

Gulf of Maine Association in Management and Finance17

Meeting Schedule for MA Secretariat July 2012 – June 2013.....18

Strategy for increasing philanthropic and corporate support: one focus is on habitat restoration in the provinces19

Presentation of Action Plan Workplans21

ESIP and the Delivery of Ecosystem Indicators22

Coastal Hazards Resilience Committee23

Ecosystem Health Committee24

Developing an Economic Model for Evaluation25

Fundraising for the Council26

Core Services.....28

Migrating GOM hard-copy library to the digital age29



Working Group June 2012 meeting agenda

Tuesday, June 5, 2012 – Delta Hotel, Fredericton NB

7:30 AM	Breakfast hosted by New Brunswick
8:30 AM	Welcome, introductions, and overview of objectives for the meeting <i>Rob Capozzi – Working Group Chair - New Brunswick Dept. of Environment and Local Government</i>
8:40 AM PG 5 PG 15 NONE PG 16 PG 17 PG 18 PG 19	Consent agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ March WG meeting summary acceptance ▪ New Council letterhead recommendation to Council for approval. ▪ Updated TAPAS format acceptance ▪ Gulf of Maine Association update ▪ Management and Finance Terms of Reference ▪ Proposed MA Secretariat 2012-2013 meeting schedule ▪ Strategy for increasing philanthropic and corporate support: one focus is on habitat restoration in the provinces
8:45 AM PG 21 AND PDF POSTED TO WEBSITE	Presentation of Action Plan Work plans and discussion of organizational structure of committees and priority setting of work plans to be implemented <i>Theresa Torrent Ellis - Maine Coastal Program/SPO</i> Background: We have worked hard to revise the current Action Plan and now we have actual workplans which are in the TAPAS tool for review and approval. Outcome/Desired Action: Working Group will review the proposed Workplans and make a recommendation to move them forward for Council's approval.
10:15 AM	Working break
10:30 AM PG 22	ESIP Update <i>Susan Russell-Robinson - USGS</i> Background: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Changes to ESIP web based tools 2) Demonstration of jurisdictional representation in ESIP products 3) Group discussion of value of proposed "jurisdictional identifier feature" 4) Request for ESIP Journal submissions from GOMC Member Organizations Outcome/Desired Action: information piece and request for ESIP journal submissions.
11:00 AM PG 23	Engaging with our Action Plan Partners <i>Theresa Torrent-Ellis -</i> Background: We have now formally engaged some of our partners that have a shared interest in implementing the Action Plan through our Action Plan consultation survey. We have created a list of them and know people within those organizations (internal and external) that are their leads. Outcome/Desired Action: The Working Group understands what organizations have expressed interest in working with the Council to implement the Action Plan and will adopt recommendations for the committees to engage these partners.
11:45 AM PG 16	US Gulf of Maine Association <i>Cindy Krum – Executive Director – US Gulf of Maine Association</i> Background: Budget Update Outcome/Desired Action: Information
12:15 PM	Lunch on your own



<p>1:15 PM PG 25</p>	<p>Developing an Economic Model for Evaluation of Program and/or Organizational Success <i>Rob Capozzi, and Steve Couture - NH Dept of Environmental Services</i> Background: As a follow up to the March 2012 Working Group session with Dr Robert Johnston, members were identified to move forward a recommendation to Working Group in June on the desired outcomes and potential tools needed to be developed to be able to achieve these economic evaluation tools. Outcome/Desired Action: Working Group will bring a strategy to the Council for approval.</p>
<p>1:45 PM</p>	<p>Climate Network Update <i>Ellen Mecray - NOAA, U.S. Co-Chair</i> Background: 1) discussion on intent and council desires for the climate network 2) review current inclusion of the network in the council's action plan 3) consider and review candidates for Canadian co-chair vacancy 4) discuss membership, Federal/provincial/state on US and Canadian sides Outcomes/Desired Actions: Recommend Canadian co-chair to Council, recommend membership and network goals to council, seek to energize council on network opportunities</p>
<p>2:00 PM</p>	<p>Committee and Subcommittee engagement – Potential SOE Update Background: Outcomes/Desired Action:</p>
<p>2:45 PM</p>	<p>Guest Presentation: The St. John River Society <i>Ms. Molly Demma</i> Background: The St. John River Society exists for the appreciation and wise use of the natural and cultural resources of the St. John River watershed. The Society was founded in 1992 by a group of individuals dedicated to the promotion and appreciation of the St. John River and the stewardship of its resources. Today the organization represents the entire length of the St. John River and undertakes programs that ensure its continued sustainable use and recognition as one of the major rivers of Canada. Outcome/Desired Action: Information piece</p>
<p>3:15 PM PG 26</p>	<p>Engaging the foundation community <i>David Keeley, Fund Development Coordinator</i> Background One of the Council's fund development strategies is to work in partnership with the foundation community to address the regional priorities described in its Action Plan. In 2010 it convened a funders forum to increase awareness about the Council and bi-national priorities and to cultivate foundation support of all parties working on these issues. One emerging approach is to increase Canadian philanthropic and corporate support for local habitat restoration projects in the provinces. A first step is to convene foundation leadership and staff through conference calls and a 1-day funders forum. Our intent is to 1) introduce them to the GOMC and its role as a regional convener, 2) describe the regional priorities in 2012-17 Action Plan, 3) share the depth and breadth of their current environmental portfolio, and 4) explore their interest in securing additional funding for environmental conservation and habitat restoration. Outcome/Desired Action <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Working Group is aware of this effort and discusses opportunities and issues; and ▪ The Working Group develops recommendations to Council. </p>
<p>4:00 PM</p>	<p>Items removed from Consent Agenda and Adjourn</p>
<p>4:15 PM</p>	<p>Adjourn</p>
<p>4:30 PM</p>	<p>Departure from hotel lobby for boat tour of St. John River</p>
<p>6:30 PM</p>	<p>Small boat / field tour of St. John River and Group Dinner at Gagetown, NB</p>



Wednesday, June 6, 2012 – Delta Hotel, Fredericton, NB

7:30 AM	Breakfast hosted by New Brunswick
8:30 AM	Gulfwatch New Business Plan and Proposal for Next Steps <i>Peter Wells and Christian Krahfors - Gulfwatch</i> Background: Presentation of new Business Plan for WG consideration and action. Outcome/Desired Action:
9:15 AM PG 2/	Secretariat Report on Next Steps re: Core Services Contracts Rob Capozzi and Martin Boulerice – NB Department of Environment and Local Government Background: Report out on new provisioning of Core Services Contracts via contracting each of Council Coordination, Fund Development, IT, and GOMT directly with Secretariat and putting each of these contracts out for tender. Outcomes/Desired Actions: Provide WG with new deliverables for each of Council Coordination and Fund Development in accordance with the requirements of the new Action Plan.
10:00 AM	Break
10:15 AM	Report on website upgrades <i>Jim Cradock, Yellahoose LLC</i> Outcome/Desired Action: Information
11:00 AM	Guest Presentation: Petitcodiac River’s causeway removal and its early signs of recovery. <i>Sentinelles Petitcodiac Riverkeeper</i> Outcome: Information
12:00 PM	Lunch on your own
1:00 PM	Report Out on Gulf of Maine Times Changes and Updates <i>Theresa Torrent-Ellis</i> Background: A recommendation resulted from our consultation with Water Words That Work that the Council assess the current format and frequency of the Gulf of Maine Times, Theresa, with guidance from Times Editorial team, worked on follow up with Eric Eckl to develop the recommendations for changes to the Times. Outcome: Working Group will recommend that the Council adopt the recommended changes to the Times.
1:45 PM PG 24	GOMC Library holdings – digitizing what we have <i>Theresa Torrent-Ellis</i> Background: Library holdings with the Maine State Planning Office require digitization. Discussion of next steps to ensure safeguard of the collection. Outcome: Decision on path forward.
3:00 PM	Adjourn
6:00 PM	GOMC Awards Reception – Governor’s Residence – 51 Woodstock Road (beside Delta hotel)
8:00 PM	Group Dinner at Bruno’s Restaurant

Working Group meeting summary

Boston, MA • March 14-15, 2012

Working Group Members present

Heather Breeze, Department of Fisheries and Oceans for Tim Hall; Rob Capozzi, NB Department of Environment; Melanie Corkum for Jackie Olsen, Environment Canada; Steven Couture, NH Department of Environmental Services; Sophia Foley, NS Department of Environment; Jennifer Hackett, Department of Fisheries and Oceans; Betsy Nicholson, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; Kathryn Parlee, Environment Canada; Ann Rodney, US Environmental Protection Agency; Jack Schwartz, MA Division of Marine Fisheries; Theresa Torrent-Ellis, ME State Planning Office; Prassede Vella, MA Office of Coastal Zone Management; and Peter Wells, Dalhousie University/Bay of Fundy Ecosystem Partnership.

Working Group Members present via webinar/conference call

Justin Huston, NS Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture.

Others present

Mel Coté, US Environmental Protection Agency and GOMC Councillor; Eric Eckl, Water Words that Work; Robert Johnston, Clark University; Steve Jones, University of New Hampshire; Stephen Landry, NH Department of Environmental Services; Gunnar Lauenstein, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; Deb Loiselle, NH Department of Environmental Services; Ru Morrison, University of NH and GOMC Councillor, Becca Newhall, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; Stephen Perkins, Environmental Protection Agency and GOMC Councillor; and Michele L. Tremblay, naturesource communications.

Others present via conference call

David Keeley, The Keeley Group and Cindy Krum, Krum Steele Consulting.

Opening remarks

Rob Capozzi, NB Department of Environment and Working Group Chair welcomed the participants who introduced themselves.

Consent Agenda

Heather Breeze solicited enthusiastic and committed volunteers for the State of the Gulf of Maine Editorial Committee. Of particular need are representatives from a US federal agency and Canadian provincial department. Editors for discrete theme papers will be solicited. Michele suggested that the solicitation be posted to the Working Group and Council listserves. Private sector Councilors, in particular, may not be aware of this opportunity. A commitment of at least one year is important. Peter Wells has prepared a new emerging issues list, which he distributed for comments.

Decision	Lead/contact	Due date
The Working Group accepted the consent agenda.	N/A	

Action	Lead/contact	Due date
Rob Capozzi will begin in June 2012 as the Canadian provincial member of the State of the Gulf of Maine Editorial Committee	Heather Breeze with Rob Capozzi	June 2012
Betsy Nicholson will work with NOAA staff to identify the US federal member for the State of the Gulf of Maine Editorial Committee	Heather Breeze with Betsy Nicholson	March 2012

Further information is available in the meeting briefing note posted at http://www.gulfofmaine.org/council/internal/docs/gomc_wg_march_2012.pdf.

Action Agenda

Musselwatch Program and possible collaborations with Gulfwatch

Peter Wells, Canadian Co-chair, Gulfwatch

Gunnar Lauenstein, NOAA National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science presented the Musselwatch Program, including its current collaboration with Gulfwatch's mussel monitoring. comparability of data produced by different laboratories. They are required to use National Institute of Standards and Technology protocols. The comparative analysis includes Gulfwatch, which is currently working on the issue.

Peter Wells presented an update on Gulfwatch's Annual Meeting and the EcoSystem Indicator Partnership linkages. The focus was the *Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment Action Plan* Goal 2 and the lack of resources for implementation. Overall \$55,000 is needed for 2012-2013 operations including coordination, analyses, and reporting. Department of Fisheries and Oceans is funding and supporting the sample archiving.

The Working Group discussed the need for sustained funding for Gulfwatch. There is substantial documentation of Gulfwatch and Musselwatch data usage. Gunnar felt that NOAA collaborating with Gulfwatch is a way to keep supporting both of the programs. Steve Jones feels that the program is not expensive given the huge amount of volunteer and other in-kind support. Theresa feels that \$22,000 is well worth the price for the support and that she has provided funding through the Maine Coastal Program.

The presentation is posted at <http://www.gulfofmaine.org/council/internal/presentations/201203/>.

Update on NERCOOS

Ru Morrison, Northeastern Regional Association of Coastal and Ocean Observing Systems (NERACOOS) and Councillor with the Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment introduced NERACOOS to the Working Group. The buoy and other observation data program are essential for any ocean users including scientists, managers, search-and-rescue, and fishermen. Data, including that from visibility sensors, throughout the Gulf of Maine and the Scotian shelf are included.

The presentation is posted at <http://www.gulfofmaine.org/council/internal/presentations/201203/>.

Discussion on regional inter-organizational ocean and coastal collaboration document

Rob Capozzi introduced Theresa Torrent-Ellis, who provided background on the Richert report recommendations on collaborations and mergers with the four organizations including the Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment (GOMC), Northeast Regional Association of Coastal and Ocean Observing Systems (NERACOOS), Northeast Regional Ocean Council (NROC), and Regional Committee on Ocean Management (RCOM). The report completion was later than expected, as were the reviews, discussions, and outcomes from each of the four organizations named in the report. Theresa said that the report was not recommendations but was the results and analysis from interviews. The new draft of the report includes the list of individuals that Evan Richert and David Keeley interviewed under their respective contracts with the Maine Coastal Program. The Council will discuss the report at its June 2012 meeting. During the last Massachusetts Secretariat year, the (then) Council Chair opened a process to merge and eliminate organizations.

Rob opened the discussion on Working Group members' reactions to the report. The end product of this discussion will be to provide the Council with recommendations at its June 2012 meeting.

Ann Rodney pointed out that the handouts were distributed moments ago vs. being included in the meeting briefing packet or emailed ahead of time. She said that this is the second time that this has happened with this process. Only the *Compilation of organization priorities* as submitted to the briefing book—not the *Gulf of Maine Transboundary Initiatives Integration Workshop March 27, 20078 report* and the *NROC Collaboration Opportunities* documents.

Heather said that the several Canadian agencies convened a conference call and while they agreed that collaboration was important, they do not agree with the recommendations. In particular, if the Council will only focus on discussions and information exchange, they will have a difficult time participating in the Council. There is a suggestion to get away from health reporting but it is a gap on the *Compilation* document. They support continuing to implement the Action Plan. A search for efficiencies is acceptable but not the mergers and eliminations of the Council. Another opportunity for efficiency might be for agency priorities to be brought to the Council to address collaboratively.

Kathryn provided comments on behalf of RCOM Coordinating Committee with managers and senior level advisors from key organizations. There is recognition that those who are part of this organization also are GOMC participants but they expressed, through interviews, that the report is beyond what they were expecting and they were surprised by the recommendations. They are supportive of efficiencies and collaboration to maximize agency resources. Recommendation 2 was the focus—they are supportive of the Council being the transboundary bridge organization but the official recognition must come from the full RCOM at its October annual meeting.

Steve Couture spoke from his personal reflections working with the Council and NROC. He agrees that agency priorities being addressed at the Council table is important. This is not reflected in the Richert report. As an NROC representative, he feels that there are simple or easy collaborative opportunities as outlined in the *NROC Collaboration Opportunities* handout, including committee and activity merger. Ocean planning efforts could be coordinated between the Council and NROC.

Betsy feels that the best way to combine efforts is with content and that NROC doesn't want to see the Council go away. They recognize the unique transboundary nature of the Council and its programmatic work. NROC is planning a May retreat that will include exploration of committee structure models. Marine spatial planning must be addressed as specified in the oceans management initiative. The NROC intends to continue to have the US Gulf of Maine Association (USGOMA) act as its fiscal agent and is applying for a new funding source.

Ru provided his perspective from his work with NERACOOS. He reported that NROC and NERACOOS committee integration or merger is currently under way including the coastal and ecosystem health group. He said that this effort includes Canadian participation. He proposed joint regional committees. He likes some parts of the Richert report such as joint meetings every several years, co-convened with the four organizations. NERACOOS has a federally specified mission so it must continue its work to fulfill it. He felt that a summit next year. He offered money, depending on federal budget outcomes in the US. Theresa said it was too much work and her Councilor is concerned about the resources needed.

Jennifer felt that the exercise was difficult given the task of comparing as similar very different organizations. In particular, the Council is the only true transboundary organization. It also works with many data that do not fit into the other three organizations' mission and activities. She provided examples of other regions' experience with multiple organizations including in the Gulf of Mexico.

Theresa asked if there was an issue or question that should be addressed. She reminded the Working Group that some asked about expanding the effort to include additional organizations in an expanded report. She asked for input on whether or not to proceed.

Heather thought that the motivation might have been participation fatigue and asked if the states and provinces agreed. Steve wants to be more involved in issues such as climate change adaptation and would like to learn more about the Canadian experience but he wants to do it with just one organization. He said that everyone can always do better to work together more efficiently. He noted that he has not participated in the Council for very long.

Jack said that his agency constantly needs transboundary information, perspectives, and collaboration for their work. He does not feel that the role of organizations such as NROC is defined, particularly in regard to fisheries management issues. He is concerned about organizations and interests will be subsumed. He feels that the GOMC has always been the place to work collectively. He doesn't see much opportunity for traction or progress to be gained from the Richert report recommendations. He does not see the Council's role as viable in the report. He feels that the US should better engage with Canada not less and is concerned that the report recommendations would harm that process.

Theresa responded to Heather's question from a perspective of working with three other organizations. Kathleen Leyden has diminished resources to identify priorities and resources to address them. Theresa said that she has heard from states and Environment Canada that there will be fewer resources available and that Cindy Krum has reminded her that there will be less funding. She cares about the Council but has to be realistic about its future.

Prassede said that funding is the biggest issue being faced and that perhaps resources were being stretched too thinly. In general, Massachusetts' supports the recommendations in the report. She feels that the Council has an important role to play and could focus more on important functions that fall through the cracks.

Becca agreed that the GOMC is unique and important for information sharing. She is sympathetic to the fatigue and overlap issues. She suggested that there were some committees that could be more collaborative as a pilot and then see where other work together could occur. She noted that some "between the cracks" items may be lost.

Sophia provided input from several perspectives. Finding efficiencies is good but feels that a lot of important things that the GOMC stands for were lost in the Richert report. She doesn't feel that the right questions are being asked and answered in the Richert document. It's not just about sharing. Justin echoed Sophia's statements. He added that when the process and report was first presented, he is not concerned about US priorities to align NROC with the Council. He reminded the WG that when NROC was created a couple of years ago, there was concern and discussion about it drawings resources away from the GOMC. This would create more of a time and resource crunch for the Canadians to participate in NERACOOS and NROC committees. He echoed Jack's comments that the GOMC is the place for both the US and Canada to work together.

Sophia provided input from several perspectives. Finding efficiencies is good but feels that a lot of important things that the GOMC stands for were lost in the Richert report. She doesn't feel that the right questions are being asked and answered in the Richert document. It's not just about sharing. Justin echoed Sophia's statements. He added that when the process and report was first presented, he is not concerned about US priorities to align NROC with the Council. He reminded the WG that when NROC was created a couple of years ago, there was concern and discussion about it drawings resources away from the GOMC. This would create more of a time and resource crunch for the Canadians to participate in NERACOOS and NROC committees. He echoed Jack's comments that the GOMC is the place for both the US and Canada to work together.

Melanie spoke for Environment Canada. While funding is uncertain, it has made commitments to the GOMC on as many levels as possible. If the GOMC's scale and focus shifts, their commitment has lost its justification. A larger geographic scale will necessitate going to headquarters and will complicate and minimize EC participation and resources. The EC funding requirements have to align with EC's priorities as the Council implements them. The Action Plan is great example of how well CA and US work together, the work plan development is the opportunity for refined agency alignment with the GOMC.

Rob said that New Brunswick, GOMC Councillors, Deputy Ministers, and Assistant Deputy Ministers, are very concerned. He echoed Justin. The GOMC is a very good fit for them and they want to continue to see the programmatic activities and other Action Plan implementation to assure the health of the Gulf of Maine. With many

small watershed groups, water quality is the priority and the GOMC is the organization to coordinate these efforts. They are sympathetic about the funding and time crunch but this is US issue and not one for Canadians.

Peter Wells provided his perspective as a scientist. He agreed that a period region-wide conference would be helpful and accomplish larger communication and collaboration. Some regional committees may make sense as well. RARGOM is not featured and could be a good convener.

Betsy said that there isn't necessarily a need for a wholesale change. A regional summit could help bring together a lot of additional federal and other government agencies. Another outcome would be identifying emerging issues and opportunities to work on them while continuing the self-analysis. Niches are important to recognize. Ecosystem health and climate change hazard efforts could be combined.

Peter said that 2014 Canada Coastal Conference is booked for Halifax and could be the seat for the first regional summit. Jennifer said that using technology (conference calls, webinars, and document sharing) and coordinating meetings can help with the stated fatigue. She said that the Council will be twenty-five years old in 2014. Justin has purchased a better conference phone as did Maine so technology could be better supported.

Michele agrees with Peter and reminded everyone about the Council's past hosting of federal coordination workshops, supported in the past by the US Department of Interior and other agencies, combined with Gulf of Maine Summits and Ru's offer.

Jack asked if the Council might elevate the awareness of elected officials via a resolution of NEGECP or other organization to publicly state support for and recognition of the GOMC's work. This is a way to stop funding cuts and prioritize additional support for the GOMC. Rob agreed and said that he is always working toward that goal within the NB provincial government. Ru felt that the GOMC receives significantly more from its supporting agencies than many other groups, which demonstrates the GOMC's reputation and track record.

Steve Couture thought that a resolution relevant to regional resilience would be a way to align Action Plan and NROC activities. Ru felt that the geographic scope was very large from Long Island Sound to Prince Edward Island. Any collaboration will have to include this entire region. Steve Couture said that the far reach would not matter because the approach would translate equally as well in Rhode Island and Nova Scotia. Kathryn said that coordination of the multi-entity committees, as proposed by NERACOOS, may be an issue. Melanie asked if the original question should be addressed before additional recommendations are made. The only way to see if the expanded geographic region will be to try it. Jennifer is working on similar efforts but it is more of a zone rather than a defined area. Cindy agrees, given the NOAA Climate Change Office grant. Involvement is driven by fund availability. The report suggested that NERACOOS and GOMA financial management should be merged. This is not an option now but may make more sense after the new GOMA board of directors is established but not right now.

Betsy said that context and economies of scale should be the focus. Theresa said that many of the Richert recommendations have been addressed in the new Action Plan. Theresa stressed the importance of face-to-face meetings and that technology should not replace it.

Betsy said that the WG must go through each recommendation and say yea, nay, or otherwise. Steve Couture disagreed and said that another report led to a discussion with the Working Group's own recommendations. An example of collaboration is the recent letter signed by the GOMC, NROC, and NERACOOS.

Rob summarized that the Richert report focuses primarily on US "fatigue." This is not the case in Canada, however, efficiencies are important.

Working Group members identified the value of GOMC as being the best international entity to deliver its programs and attain jurisdictional objectives. The Working Group did not come to consensus on the Richert report as a whole but has formed the following recommendations.

- Continue to implement the GOMC Action Plan while exploring collaboration and efficiencies.
- Explore opportunities for committee collaboration the context of the Gulf of Maine, recognizing the broader boundaries of organizations such as Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment (GOMC), Northeast Regional Association of Coastal and Ocean Observing Systems (NERACOOS), Northeast Regional Ocean Council (NROC), and Regional Committee on Ocean Management (RCOM). Pilots would be ecosystem health and coastal resiliency.
- A regularly convened summit, beginning with the 2014 Coastal Zone Canada conference in Halifax for all partner organizations. This event can recognize the Council's twenty-fifth anniversary.
- Using current communication technology and other tools to maximize remote participation in meetings. For instance, the future Secretariat will explore convening the spring or fall meeting virtually.
- Coordinating with partners and co-scheduling meetings so that travel may be combined and travel approval can be facilitated.*
- Updates from organizations as a standing agenda item will be included in agendas for the GOMC and other organizations' meetings. Partner organizations will be asked to provide their updates for the GOMC's meeting briefing books.

**The suggestion was made to facilitate additional conference calls or webinars for the Working Group and the Council to communicate more frequently with the objective of reducing meeting duration and travel. The Working Group will consider convening one spring or fall meeting via video conferencing.*



Decision	Lead/contact	Due date
<p>The Working Group recommends that the Council consider its recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to implement the GOMC Action Plan while exploring collaboration and efficiencies. ▪ Explore opportunities for committee collaboration the context of the Gulf of Maine, recognizing the broader boundaries of organizations such as Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment (GOMC), Northeast Regional Association of Coastal and Ocean Observing Systems (NERACOOS), Northeast Regional Ocean Council (NROC), and Regional Committee on Ocean Management (RCOM). Pilots would be ecosystem health and coastal resiliency. ▪ A regularly convened summit, beginning with the 2014 Coastal Zone Canada conference in Halifax for all partner organizations. This event can recognize the Council's twenty-fifth anniversary. ▪ Using current communication technology and other tools to maximize remote participation in meetings. For instance, the future Secretariat will explore convening the spring or fall meeting virtually. ▪ Coordinating with partners and co-scheduling meetings so that travel may be combined and travel approval can be facilitated.* ▪ Updates from organizations as a standing agenda item will be included in agendas for the GOMC and other organizations' meetings. Partner organizations will be asked to provide their updates for the GOMC's meeting briefing books. <p><i>*The suggestion was made to facilitate additional conference calls or webinars for the Working Group and the Council to communicate more frequently with the objective of reducing meeting duration and travel. The Working Group will consider convening one spring or fall meeting via video conferencing.</i></p>	N/A	
Action	Lead/contact	Due date
<p>The Working Group's maritime collaboration recommendations will be included on the June 2012 Council meeting agenda.</p>	Rob Capozzi	May 2012

Communications check-up and target audience profile report

Eric Eckl, Water Words that Work and Theresa Torrent-Ellis

Eric provided a demographic overview and then presented details on his findings and recommendations for six focus areas.

1. Audience *survey* and prioritization
2. Internal procedure development
3. Database centralization and overhaul
4. Website overhaul (focus on contact capture)
5. Email overhaul
6. Develop direct marketing capability

Justin asked for clarification on whether these applications are for internal or external communications. Steve Couture feels that participating agencies are communicating GOMC activities to their own because they know their own audiences. Michele pointed out that the People Finder and NGO database are the basis for the Constant Contact mailings. This database is key not only for internal audiences but the public uses the People Finder as well. Eric said that his surveys indicated that no one feels that the database is updated or that anyone is responsible for doing so. The correction is that there is only one database (not several) and it populates Constant Contact. There

have been no undeliverable email addresses error messages for a long time but there are recipients who opt-out from each mailing.

Gathering information from participants has been a privacy issue (Patriot Act is an obstacle for Canadian data sharing) as well as a maintenance one. It is difficult to disaggregate for updates data once it is incorporated into the database. In addition, jurisdictions felt strongly that they wished to communicate GOMC information to their constituents vs. the Council doing so directly. Eric feels that de-centralized contacts and databases are not as effective as single ones.

Steve Couture suggested that instead of just the *Gulf of Maine Times* three or four times a year, the GOMC distribute articles and news updates via Constant Contact with a push to subscribe. The New Hampshire Coastal Program and COINAtlantic employ this approach. Eric said that this is a good idea. It is an old model, reminiscent of print publications, to save up articles for one distribution vs. sending them as they are available. Becca feels that the jurisdictions can play a role by forwarding these messages. Facebook is not useful unless content on the website is updated often. Eric feels that LinkedIn or Constant Contact emails are a better investment vs. Facebook. This is further hampered by the lack of funding for the *Times*.

Eric noted that he did not receive a proper thank you letter when he made an online donation. The Maine Coastal Program has handling this function but staff has been cut. He suggested that contacts be eliminated from the website and replaced with an online contact request form. Some participants indicated that they are not comfortable with these forms vs. being able to see contacts, decide who they wish to contact, and be able to reach them directly. Some publications have forms to gather downloader information. The website must be overhauled with the objective of more contact capture. The website is an online brochure and should be converted to capture user information and convert them to subscribers. There were a number of direct mail and telemarketing recommendations to alert key stakeholders or to distribute important announcements.

There were questions about not only how to communicate but what (content) is communicated. Eric said that what is communicated is determined by to whom the GOMC is communicated. He suggested that Constant Contact recipients should be surveyed on communication preferences including what they need and how they wish to receive it. He provided further detail to each of the six recommendation areas (the full presentation is posted at <http://www.gulfofmaine.org/council/internal/presentations/201203/>), including goal setting and measuring results with plans for improvement and refinement.

Action	Lead/contact	Due date
Transmit to Eric Eckl examples of recent Constant Contact communications	Theresa Torrent-Ellis	immediate

Promotion of the Action Plan

Theresa Torrent-Ellis has been including the Action Plan in all of her presentations on behalf of the Maine Coastal Program and urged Working Group members to do the same. She has found the executive summary helpful in these situations. The media event for this meeting was not optimal given scheduling and other circumstances. There will be another opportunity at the June 2012 Council meeting.

Further information is available in the meeting briefing note posted at http://www.gulfofmaine.org/council/internal/docs/gomc_wg_march_2012.pdf.

The presentation is posted at <http://www.gulfofmaine.org/council/internal/presentations/201203/>.

Action	Lead/contact	Due date
Working Group members will promote the Action Plan in their jurisdictional presentations and provide summaries of their outcomes for the June 2012 meeting briefing packet	Jurisdictional representatives	Ongoing and by May 14

Internal Items

Cindy reported that the Council's Nominating Committee will be recommending a ten-member board of directors that will be three-fifths US and two-fifths Canadian members, The US Association board will vote for the new bylaws, then will vote on the new members, and the revised organizational structure will be established. Ru added that there has been progress identifying the new directors. There is not a conflict of interest for Canadian federal members to be voting members of a board of directors. This may change with Canadian funds in the (soon to be DBA) Gulf of Maine Association account. Melanie will provide an update on this policy. In the United States, this is a conflict of interest. David clarified that voting members vs. ex-officio membership are two different things: ex-officio members can and do vote.

Rob Capozzi opened the discussion on the Council's letterhead and solicited suggestions to change it to represent more equitably the private sector participants. Michele and David suggested that the private sector Councillors be represented via a list of their organizations (not their individual names) under their respective jurisdictions. Science advisors will have their own category.

Cindy reported on the process to identify and secure Action Plan implementation funding. She reviewed the financial documents that were emailed to the Working Group members highlighting the updates since the last draft. Dues are expected to be on par with last year's receipts. The Royal Bank of Canada grant proposal was not accepted because the USGOMA did not conduct an A-133 single audit because its US federal fund expenditures were less than the \$500,000 threshold. The RBC will not accept the most recent audit and the Canadian Association was not willing to provide their full organizational financial statements. Ru said that NERACOOS could provide assistance should the need arise again. Steve pointed out that the GOMC could have looked beyond itself to a partner. Cindy said that the RBC would likely not have accepted this condition given that NERACOOS was not listed or in any way a part of the proposed project and has not been part of it.

Decision	Lead/contact	Due date
The Council letterhead will be updated with jurisdictional private sector organizations and the science Councillors' organizations	N/A	

Action	Lead/contact	Due date
Provide conflict of interest clarification for Canadian federal voting participation in the Gulf of Maine Association	Melanie Corkum and Cindy Krum	April 2012
Update the Council letterhead with the private sector Councillors' organizations listed under their respective jurisdictions. Science Advisor Councillors will be listed under their own category.	Rob Capozzi and Michele Tremblay	Immediate

Workshop on economic assessment of Council programs

Theresa provided background on the Council's questions about determining the economic value of their work. She introduced Robert J. Johnston, Clark University, who led the Working Group through an exercise to demonstrate how to measure economic value. He has worked with groups to determine what questions they wish to answer including those that help determine what choices to make or to justify decisions that have been made. With colleagues, he has published **Economic Analysis for Ecosystem-Based Management: Applications to Marine and Coastal Environments** (http://books.google.com/books?id=CUq6QgAACAAJ&source=gbs_book_other_versions). Others wish to have this information to show the value of the work, such as restoration programs, that they have conducted. Jobs may not be the best indicator. For example, jobs can be created after a hurricane but this is not a result of a positive environmental change. Some economic activity is circular and is not a measure of growth. Economic benefits can be measured in savings or ecosystem services received at no cost (free fish from a local, healthy spring). Caution should be exercised when comparing the economic benefits of a healthy ecosystem vs. development such as a construction projects, e.g. business part, condominiums. Long-term effects may be more positive for ecosystems but most analyses capture a snapshot in time so construction jobs gains will look better than the sustained environment measures. Return on investment is one of the most important analyses that the Council can conduct. Willingness to pay studies can backfire—what one is willing to pay for the blue whale can be misinterpreted to represent the value of the blue whale. Economists don't feel that it makes sense to value an ecosystem—it's immeasurable. What should be measured is the value of change. There was a concern that in the absence of a study or assignment of value, the value could be perceived of as \$0. Are there certain metrics that the Council should use? The answer depends on what are the questions that are being asked (how many jobs are created?) or what kinds of justification is requested (how many jobs are created?). The question should also be to whom one wishes to speak. There s a question to be answered: What is the risk of not conducting activities such as habitat restoration? What will happen if toxins are left unchecked or erosion is allowed to continue? What will happen if nothing is done? Sustainable communities (Goal 3) is an application of this kind of analysis. Working Group members wanted to know what the resulting outcomes are. They would like the analyses that create accurate tools for the GOMC's fundraising and policy objectives. are created for the GOMC. The GOMC may wish not to focus on strictly "jobs" as a measurement but instead provide more sophisticated benefit transfer analyses. NOAA and NERACOOS would like to see anecdotal support and testimonials that can be used to augment economic studies.

The Working Group felt that it should identify actions and activities that are directly related to the functions of the GOM and the GOMC to justify their existence and funding. The Council will explore this issue within a specific framework during its June 2012 meeting including

- Will this focus on only the information, publications, and programs that the Council produces?
- Influence and impact (which will be captured?)
- On which issues will the Council focus?
- How does the Council effectively use an economic analysis?

The Working Group discussed its particular needs including what to measure, why to measure it, and how to measure it.

What to measure

- Attaching economic numbers to the Council's actions – how/what are we leveraging with the participants' funds?
- Unified message on the value of GOMC actions
- Species at risk (with caution about willingness to pay and other measures mis-applying values to particular species)
- Support value of industries that are supported by healthy ecosystem and the Council's work that directly impacts it positively such as Gulfwatch data value relative to closing and re-opening of shellfish beds (and possibly the measures of illness from consuming contaminated shellfish, such as lost work days due to illness) and the value of fisheries and the link to the Habitat Restoration Partnership and grants program
- Ocean jobs analysis

Why to measure it

- Return on investment for Council dues
- Used as justification for additional investment (beyond dues)
- For attention and focus from national headquarters of federal agencies (ministers, agency administrators) for policy and other resource attention for the region (western coasts vs. Atlantic region)

How to measure it

- How does the Council reflect the Action Plan goal (Goal 1) of "A healthy Gulf of Maine..." in dollars (needs a biophysical assessment)?

Action	Lead/contact	Due date
Include a working session on economic analyses on the Council's 2012 meeting agenda	Rob Capozzi and Steve Couture	June 2012
The link for the pilot evaluation conducted on the Habitat Restoration Grants Partnership will be distributed to the Working Group.	Rob Capozzi	
Robert Johnston's selected past study models will be distributed to the Working Group.	Robert Johnston	
The June 2012 Council meeting agenda will include an activity for them to identify questions that they must answer to justify funding and other resource allocations.	Rob Capozzi	
Working Group members will provide to the Secretariat links to their jurisdiction and agency reports for possible consolidation (in lieu of a primary data production) as part of a Gulf-wide economic study, which may require professional economist assistance.	Rob Capozzi	

Merrimack Village Dam and Maxwell Pond Dam removal and river restoration projects

Steve Couture introduced Stephen C. Landry and Deb Loiselle, NH Department of Environmental Services. Stephen and Deb thanked the Council for its grants, which made possible, in part, the two dam removal and river restoration projects for Black Brook in Manchester, New Hampshire (Maxwell Pond Dam) and the Souhegan River in Merrimack, New Hampshire (Merrimack Village Dam). There are either 625, 2,621, or 5,176 dams in New Hampshire, depending on the definitions and classifications used. The Council-funded projects have been a success. The projects have been using and continue to use the Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment's [Stream Barrier Removal Monitoring Guide](#) and the recommended protocols contained within it to measure project success within both the Black Brook and Souhegan River project areas. Stephen and Deb offered their perspectives in using the *Guide* protocols, particularly with the terrestrial and littoral vegetation surveys. These surveys are costly, time consuming, and require expertise that many water agencies do not have. They recommended that the same team who conducts the pre-removal survey conduct the post-removal surveys in order to maintain the same level of detail, quality control/quality assurance, and consistency with protocol implementation. For the Maxwell Pond Dam Removal/Black Brook Restoration Project, fish population surveys conducted according to the *Guide protocols* four months after removal of the dam within the former impoundment area indicated the presence of only four fish species with a total population of nineteen. However, just two months later, the number of species of fish present in the former impoundment doubled to eight with 99 individual fish collected. By 2010, there were nine species of fish and 109 individuals surveyed in the former impoundment area on Black Brook. Species of note that have returned to Black Brook since dam removal and river restoration are the Bridle shiner, American eel, Sea lamprey, and tessellated darter.. The macroinvertebrate surveys demonstrate a return of more sensitive species, increased population diversity throughout the project area and more stable populations downstream of the former impoundment where the

habitat has improved with the natural sediment transport regime restored. The pre- and post-removal particle size analyses demonstrate the expected trend of a silt dominated habitat to a more distributed sand, gravel, cobble, and boulder substrate within the former impoundment area where Black Brook continues to seek equilibrium and a stable plan form. The physical, topographic surveys that result in cross sections and longitudinal profiles along Black Brook support the particle size analyses and demonstrate the transition from a sediment-choked stream channel to one that has cut down through a century of accumulated sediments and is now transitioning into a riffle, run, pool, glide habitat suitable for supporting diverse and healthy populations of fish and invertebrates. Stephen informed attendees that this project restored fish passage to nearly eight miles of Black Brook and that implementation of the *Guide* protocols will continue on an annual basis as long as staff resources are available.

Deb presented the project area history and results of the Merrimack Village Dam removal and restoration of that portion of the Souhegan River in Merrimack, New Hampshire. Unlike Black Brook and the Maxwell Pond Dam, the Merrimack Village Dam had a long history associated with industrial development in Merrimack, New Hampshire with grist/saw mills, shoe manufacturing, production of nails, cotton/woolen processing, and chemical production all utilizing the Merrimack Village Dam and the associated mill infrastructure over the last two hundred years. This was the first dam removal and river restoration project in New Hampshire to implement the *Guide* protocols. Deb was a major contributor to the development of the protocols and excited to utilize them on a dam removal and river restoration project of this scale. Prior to dam the dam removal, a fish population study completed in 2007 documented 62 individual fish with six species present. Of that population, only one adult Atlantic salmon was present in the impoundment behind the Merrimack Village Dam on the Souhegan River. The post-dam removal fish population survey performed in 2009 revealed the dramatic increase in total fish present to 210 with eight species present. Of that population, well over 100 fish were Atlantic salmon and reflects the first time that kind of concentration of salmon has been seen in this reach of the Souhegan River in over two hundred years. American eel are also a species of concern at this site and were also found post-dam removal. Up to 80,000 cubic yards of sediment were transported into the downstream channel of the Souhegan River and Merrimack River from the former impoundment. This was permitted in a “slow release” and methodically to minimize impact to the rivers. The removal of the Merrimack Village Dam restored fish passage to fourteen miles of the Souhegan River.

To date, there have not been any instances in which sediment was transported to a hazardous waste facility as a result of sediment management and permitting requirements on dam removal projects in New Hampshire. New Hampshire has no tax or other incentives for dam removal and restoration unlike other provinces or states may have. Some economic studies show that river restoration increases property values. There is an aquatic resource mitigation fund in New Hampshire that is periodically available as a competitive grant source of funding for these types of projects. New Brunswick has a program. Orphaned dams, those where ownership is not clear, is an issue if the dam is impaired or an imminent threat. For the latter case in New Hampshire, the State has the authority to remove the dam. Otherwise, removal or maintenance is the dam owner’s choice. There is no list or prioritization for removal or restoration.

Further information is available in the meeting briefing note posted at http://www.gulfofmaine.org/council/internal/docs/gomc_wg_march_2012.pdf.

The presentation is posted at <http://www.gulfofmaine.org/council/internal/presentations/201203/>.

Action	Lead/contact	Due date
Steve Landry’s and Deb Loiselle’s recommendations on the Barrier Removal will be forwarded to Slade Moore.	Rob Capozzi	immediate

Work plan development for June Council meeting

Theresa Torrent-Ellis led the discussion and reviewed the handout provided earlier in the day, “Developing a 2012-2017 Work Plan for Council Approval.” This handout includes GOMC leads and prospective partners for each numbered activity, The Working Group broke into groups to address goal areas and will be reconvened to share their input that they will eventually enter into the revised online TAPAS (Tracking Action Plan Activities Systems). Some felt that this was premature. New committees should be formed first and existing ones reconfigured prior to work plan development, which the committees should be doing. Theresa selected the activities that she felt were currently in process or that have funding. Theresa thanked Justin for his work on the new TAPAS (paper) format. He acknowledged Michele Tremblay’s and Kathryn Parlee’s work on the TAPAS new template. Theresa said that the next step is for her to analyze the TAPAS paper forms and will follow up with the Working Group. Rob reported that funding is being sought for Yellohooose to update the TAPAS online template and for nature resource communications to work with committees to complete their online work plans.

Decision	Lead/contact	Due date
The TAPAS template is accepted with revisions (see action item below).	N/A	



Action	Lead/contact	Due date
Working Group members will provide their suggestions for revisions to the TAPAS template.	Justin Huston will accept the suggestions	immediate

Other business

Rob urged everyone to consider submitting a nomination for one of the many 2012 Gulf of Maine Council awards and to solicit nominations from their constituencies. The forms can be found at <http://www.gulfofmaine.org/council/internal>. Rob thanked Ann Rodney for her gracious hosting and Theresa Torrent-Ellis for the extracurricular activities planning. He thanked Steve Landry and Deb Loiselle for their presentation.

Action	Lead/contact	Due date
Working Group members will consider submitting nominations for Gulf of Maine Council awards and work with their constituencies to solicit nominations.	All Working Group members	April 30

Note: Where available, PowerPoint presentations, referenced handouts, and revised documents can be found at <http://www.gulfofmaine.org/council/internal/presentations/201203/>. The meeting briefing book may be found at <http://www.gulfofmaine.org/council/internal>.

Summary prepared by Michele L. Tremblay, natresource communications



New Council letterhead recommendations to the Council

Listing proposal

Maine

*Department of Conservation
Department of Marine Resources*

Massachusetts

*Office of Coastal Zone Management
Conservation Law Foundation
Urban Harbors Institute*

New Brunswick

*Department of Environment and Local Government
Department of Agriculture, Aquaculture, and Fisheries*

New Hampshire

*Department of Environmental Services
Northeastern Regional Association of Coastal and Ocean Observing Systems
New Hampshire Charitable Foundation*

Nova Scotia

*Department of Environment
Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture
World Wildlife Fund Canada*

Senior Science Advisors

*Gulf of Maine Research Institute
St. Andrews Biological Station*

Federal Partners

*Environment Canada
Fisheries and Oceans Canada
US Department of Interior
US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
US Environmental Protection Agency*



Gulf of Maine Association Update

Background

The action item for this initiative that was recorded in the December 8, 2011 GOMC Meeting Summary was: "The Council's Gulf of Maine Association Nominating Committee, W. Don Hudson, Ru Morrison, Jackie Olsen, and Lee Sochasky, will prepare a slate of board of directors nominations for a vote by the US Association. The current US Association Board of Directors will invite all Councilors to the conference call during which they will vote on the new nominees."

Possible activities and next steps

The Association of US Delegates to the Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment has scheduled a conference call meeting for May 24, 2012 and has extended an invitation to all Gulf of Maine Councilors to participate in the call. The purpose of the call is to establish the new Gulf of Maine Association with joint Canadian and US representation. The current US Association board plans to vote on resolutions including amended and restated bylaws and the nominating committee's recommendations for the new board of directors. The first meeting of the new Gulf of Maine Association is scheduled for June 7, 2012 at 7:30 am prior to the Gulf of Maine Council meeting. All Council members are invited as observers.

Action or outcomes requested

No action requested.

Submitted by Cynthia Krum

Gulf of Maine Association in Management and Finance

Terms of Reference edits for adoption

Background

At the December 8, 2011 Council meeting, The Council approved the implementation plan to modify the existing Association of United States Delegates to the Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment to form the "Gulf of Maine Association." One part of the implementation plan was to add two "Gulf of Maine Association" Board of Director members to the Management and Finance committee. The Management and Finance committee and the Working Group have reviewed and recommend approval of the following amended Terms of Reference (change in italics):

Management and Finance
*Terms of Reference • 12.4.08
Revised 1.5.12*

Purpose

Management and Finance (MandF) serves the Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment by managing and reporting on the Council's operations, contracting, and finances along with the service committees of Outreach (including the *Gulf of Maine Times*), Information Management, and Program Evaluation. It facilitates inter-committee coordination, establishes and monitors implementation of Council procedures (e.g., Reference Handbook, etc.), and coordinates internal policy. It organizes Council and Working Group meetings as needed including the development of agendas and reporting out of the results. It seeks to secure funding in support of approved Council initiatives and projects.

Personnel – MandF is responsible to the Council for all contractor/personnel decisions. In doing so it will delegate appropriate authority to the committees, ensure they have adequate support to perform this work and will make recommendations to the Council as needed. It will work through Secretariat Team recommendations as relates to the three Action Plan goal committees and their subcommittees.

Finance and Budget – MandF prepares the annual budget for Council and Working Group review and then oversees its implementation. (It can amend the budget if the changes do not cumulatively exceed 10% of the approved budget.)

Membership

Management and Finance is composed of a representative designated by each state and province, one provincial member at-large, one federal representative from each country, *and one Gulf of Maine Association member from each country*. The current Working Group chair serves as MandF Chair.

Support

The Council Coordinator, Development Coordinator, Administrative Assistant, and the Executive Director of the US Gulf of Maine Association provide the necessary contractor support. In addition, other Council contractors, agency representatives, and committee co-chairs may assist as needed and contracted.

Decisions

Decisions will be made by consensus.

Action or outcomes requested

Adoption of amended Management and Finance Committee Terms of Reference shown above.

Submitted by Robert Capози, Working Group Chair



Meeting Schedule for MA Secretariat July 2012 – June 2013

Background

Due to busy schedules and travel restrictions, it has become increasingly important to plan well ahead for meetings. A proposed schedule for the meetings to take place during the Massachusetts Secretariat (July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013) is provided below. This schedule was edited in response to the Working Group and the Management and Finance Committee. In addition we tried to ensure that there are no major conflicts with other meetings at this time.

Proposed meeting schedule 2012-2013

Working Group Meeting	Council Meeting	Other	Location
October 10-11, 2012	-	TBD	New Hampshire
December 11-12, 2012	December 13, 2012	TBD	Massachusetts
March 5-6, 2013		TBD	Nova Scotia (?)
June 11-12, 2013	June 13, 2013	Awards Ceremony	Massachusetts

Possible activities and next steps

If there are no major issues with this schedule planning for the next meeting in October in New Hampshire can proceed.

Action or outcomes requested

1. Provide Working Group with any major conflicts that may make it difficult for a Working Group member or Councilor to attend a meeting.
2. If there are no objections, approve the proposed schedule.

Submitted by Prassede Vella, MA Office of Coastal Zone Management

Strategy for increasing philanthropic and corporate support: one focus is on habitat restoration in the provinces

Background

A priority in the 2012-2017 GOMC Action Plan is habitat restoration. The Action Plan draws on many reports to describe the region's needs including the *Nova Scotia and New Brunswick Needs Assessment: Documenting Habitat Restoration and Land Conservation Programs and Needs* (Hinch - 2010) and the US Gulf of Maine Habitat Restoration and Conservation Plan (Alexander 2009). The new Action Plan is also greatly informed by the Gulf of Maine Council/NOAA Restoration Partnership Program. (Between 2007-2011 over 335 acres of salt marsh were restored throughout the Gulf of Maine watershed. More than 60 stream miles and 1,425 acres of lakes were made re-accessible to spawning alewife. Projects managed during this period totaled \$2.5 million, with \$3.8 million in matching non-federal support. In Nova Scotia \$200,000 was awarded to four projects that generated \$260,000 in match. In New Brunswick \$40,000 was awarded to two projects that generated \$170,000 in match.

Provincial members of the Working Group, facilitated by the Council's fund development coordinator, have begun work to increase Canadian philanthropic and corporate support for local habitat restoration projects in the provinces.

Possible activities and next steps

The core concept is to increase the amount of funding available for on-the-ground habitat restoration projects in the two provinces. (DFO staff may prepare an inventory of existing habitat restoration programs to inform our discussions.) Our intent is to learn from the experiences and leverage the Council's habitat restoration program. We want to create an ongoing competitive grant program that can be branded by the funder and other contributors. We will use the content, guidelines and seek to offer, via a Canadian restoration coordinator, hands-on technical assistance to grantees.

At this time we are considering various organizational options including:

- A re-granting program like the GOMC/NOAA partnership that is coordinated and offered by the Council;
- A re-granting program that one or more Canadian non-profits operate and the Council is a collaborator/partner; and/or
- Philanthropic sources increase their support for habitat restoration and offer funding via a competitive process directly to sub-awardees performing the work.

Progress to-date

1. An ad-hoc work group of provincial and federal staff is formed and has met a few times. It has agreed a next-step is to create a 1-2 page prospectus describing the idea.
2. Environment Canada has identified Canadian philanthropic sources and corporations that may be share an interest in supporting locally-based, on the ground habitat restoration.
3. In January 2012 the Council assisted the Fundy Community Foundation prepare a \$25,000 proposal to the NB Environmental Trust Fund that would build the capacity of FCF to secure resources and work with the Canadian foundation community on environmental conservation activities. (The proposal is pending.) Councilor Lamb helped to create an environmental field of interest fund at FCF.
4. A \$500,000 grant proposal to the Royal Bank of Canada/Blue Water Fund was prepared in 2011 and will be submitted in 2012. It will create a habitat restoration re-granting program that leverages the GOMC/NOAA restoration partnership and support a Canadian restoration coordinator.
5. A proposal concept to the corporate community is being explored. It would bundle 3-5 specific habitat restoration projects that are partially funded via the GOMC/NOAA partnership and seek Canadian corporate support to provide the remaining "20%". The Habitat Restoration Committee will discuss this idea in June.
6. A briefing of board leadership and staff with the Fundy Community Foundation (FCF), Saint John Community Foundation, the Community Foundation of Nova Scotia and the Rural Communities Foundation of Nova Scotia is being explored. FCF staff is networking with their foundation colleagues to arrange a conference call that 1) introduces them to the GOMC and its role as a regional facilitator, 2) describes the regional priorities in 2012-17 Action Plan, 3) shares their current environmental portfolio, and 4) explores their interest in securing additional funding for environmental conservation and habitat restoration.

Once the foundations have confirmed their interest in a briefing the Council will partner to develop an agenda and compile resource materials for the call. A Canadian councilor and Working Group member will join the call and help to describe what the Council is and its achievements.



7. Councilors Lamb, Hudson, Wiggin and Sochasky are discussing the merits and logistics of convening New England-based and Maritime foundations that have a demonstrated interest/capacity in environmental conservation. (It is likely several larger national foundations will also be invited.) The intent is organize and convene a 1-day coastal and ocean briefing for the foundation community that would showcase issues, have high profile speakers, and create energy for these issues. A list of foundations invitees is being developed and seed-funds for the event are being looked for (e.g., Environmental Funders Network, FCF has pledged support, etc.).

Desired actions and outcomes

1. The Working Group is aware of this effort and identifies possible philanthropic sources and corporate partners;
2. Roles in this effort by provincial non-profit organizations active in restoration and land conservation are discussed; and
3. Working Group offers recommendations to Council.

Submitted by David Keeley

Presentation of Action Plan Workplans

The Work Plan with this briefing note document is posted as a separate PDF at <http://www.gulfofmaine.org/new-site/about-the-council/meetings/>

Background: In December 2011 the Council released the 2012-2017 Action Plan and requested the Working Group to provide work plans that implement the Action Plan at its June 2012 meeting. In March the Working Group approved a revised TAPAS template and a process for committees to develop draft work plans between April and May. By mid-May about half of the work plans were submitted. (See attached resource materials)

Possible activities and next steps

The Working Group needs to develop work plan recommendations for Council consideration on June 7th. While all aspects of the work plans are of concern a special focus of WG review are 1) alignment with the Action Plan "activities" and 2) completeness of the work plans. Specific questions the Work Group should consider include:

- Are the deliverables clearly described and are the end-users identified?
- Does the list of key partners include those organizations and individuals that the Council solicited to participate in the fall of 2011 during the Action Plan partner consultation process?
- Does the work plan have a communication strategy and is it complete?
- What work plan clarifications are needed?
- Does the Working Group recommend Council approval of the work plan (with WG amendments)?

Session format -- This agenda item is a working session where people will self-select one of four groups to participate in. (Groups of 5-7 people are likely.)

- #1 - Water and habitats (1.1.1; 1.2.1; 1.2.2; 1.2.3)
- #2 - CMSP & EBM (1.3.2; 1.3.3; 1.3.4)
- #3 - Monitoring (2.1.1; 2.1.3)
- #4 - Indicators/SOE (2.2.1; 2.2.2; 2.2.3)

Each breakout will have a recorder that uses flipcharts and template to record comments and a facilitator to run the work session. Each breakout will report out their results to the Working Group and joint recommendations to Council will be developed.

Time	Activity
15-min	Overview, instructions, announce recorders/facilitators - Theresa Torrent Ellis
5-min	Create breakouts
1 hour	Breakouts to discuss each work plan)
15-min	Break
20-min	Report-outs (5-minutes for each breakout group)
30-min	Develop recommendations to Council and create presentation strategy

Action or outcome requested

1. The Working Group understands and supports the contents of each work plan.
2. The Working Group discusses those AP activities for which no work plan is available and devises an approach.
3. It recommends the Council adopt the work plans.
4. The Working Group develops a presentation strategy to Council that enables the Council to a) understand and support the work plans; b) provide guidance to committees on implementation; and c) understand the resource requirements.

Submitted by Theresa Torrent-Ellis and David Keeley

ESIP and the Delivery of Ecosystem Indicators



Eutrophication Fact Sheet

ESIP was very pleased to release the four-page Eutrophication Fact Sheet in early May. The fact sheet discusses the four priority indicators selected by the subcommittee: nutrient loading, chlorophyll *a*, secchi depth, and dissolved oxygen. As with all of the other ESIP releases, all datasets used for the fact sheet are now available in the Indicator Reporting Tool

(www2.gulfofmaine.org/esip/reporting).

Annual ESIP Steering Committee Meeting



In March ESIP's Steering Committee gathered in Boston, Massachusetts for the annual ESIP planning meeting. Steps for wrapping up ESIP 1.0's priority indicators were discussed along with direction for ESIP 2.0. In addition the morning meeting included discussion with other GOMC chairs regarding collaboration between ESIP and other parts of the Council's work.

Have you visited ESIP's Indicator Reporting Tool lately? Along with data for the eutrophication indicators much more information is available for immediate graphing: Gulfwatch, Mussel Watch, Environment Canada, and data from coastal monitoring groups. Visit: www2.gulfofmaine.org/esip/reporting.

What's next: Release of the Contaminants Fact Sheet in Late 2012!



Coastal Hazards Resilience Committee

DRAFT Terms of Reference

Purpose: The Northeastern Regional Association of Coastal and Ocean Observing Systems (NERACOOS) and the Northeast Regional Ocean Council (NROC) have formed the Coastal Hazards Resilience Committee (CHRC) to stimulate region-wide coordination and collaborative actions on shared coastal hazards priorities, including developing and disseminating region-wide decision support information. As a result the region, extending from the marine waters of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia to Long Island Sound, will better leverage human and financial resources and make more rapid progress in building the capacity of the region to prepare and respond to public health, safety and the environmental impacts of coastal storms and climate change.

Responsibilities: The Committee will periodically assess, document and communicate broadly about the coastal hazard policy, planning and regulatory needs of the coastal management, hazard mitigation and emergency management communities and other stakeholders of the two organizations; develop and implement a work plan including the management a portfolio projects; and be responsive to and provide advice to the two organizations.

Structure:

1. **Committee leadership** - The organizations will jointly designate one or more people to chair the committee. These people will have the technical and leadership skills needed to be effective as well as the capacity (e.g., interest, time, etc.). It is likely individuals that work for government (e.g., state or federal) or academia will serve as chairs. They may also be board members of either organization. The chairs will be responsible for periodic reporting to and accepting direction from the two organizations. It is expected that Chairs will manage of one or more work plan activities and actively participate in committee affairs (e.g., organize and record decisions of meetings, etc.).
2. **Membership** - The organizations will periodically assess membership of the committee and work to ensure it has representatives of government, non-profits, academia, private sector, and tribal communities. Committee membership will reflect the diverse interests of the coastal hazard community (e.g., policy, planning, regulation, investment, research, etc.), have good geographic distribution, and strive to contain various subject matter experts (e.g., coastal management, data collection and management, ocean observing, etc.) that are able to address tasks in committee work plans. Sub-committees, either standing or ad-hoc, may be formed as needed and contain individuals from the committee and outside of the committee.
3. **Expectations of committee members** - Individuals that accept an invitation to serve on the committee are expected to actively participate in committee meetings and in committee activities between meetings.
4. **Committee meetings** - Meetings will be called as needed. It is expected there will 2-3 full meetings/year.
5. **Methods of communication** - The committee will conduct its business by conference call, email, and occasionally in-person.
6. **Committee decisions** -- A quorum of 51% of the members is necessary for decisions to be made. The committee will work collaboratively to develop a consensus position on issues that it needs to act on. The committee may decide to vote on specific issues but the results are non-binding on those that oppose or abstain from the decision.

Ecosystem Health Committee

DRAFT Terms of Reference

Purpose: The Northeastern Regional Association of Coastal and Ocean Observing Systems (NERACOOS) and the Northeast Regional Ocean Council (NROC) have formed the Ecosystem Health Committee (EHC) to stimulate region-wide coordination and collaborative actions on shared ecosystem health priorities including those affecting water quality, habitats, and living resources. As a result the region, extending from the marine waters of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia to Long Island Sound, will better leverage human and financial resources and make more rapid progress in protecting and conserving our coastal and marine ecosystems.

Responsibilities: The Committee will periodically assess, document and communicate broadly about the ecosystem health policy, planning, research and regulatory priorities of ocean and coastal managers, academia, and other stakeholders of the two organizations; develop and implement a work plan including the management a portfolio projects; and be responsive to and provide advice to the two organizations.

Structure:

1. **Committee leadership** - The organizations will jointly designate one or more people to chair the committee. These people will have the technical and leadership skills needed to be effective as well as the capacity (e.g., interest, time, etc.). It is likely individuals that work for government (e.g., state or federal) or academia will serve as chairs. They may also be board members of either organization. The chair(s) will be responsible for setting agendas and otherwise leading the committee, recruiting members, and periodically reporting to and accepting direction from the two organizations.
2. **Membership** - The organizations will periodically assess membership of the committee and work to ensure it has representatives of government, non-profits, academia, private sector, and tribal communities. Committee membership will reflect the diverse elements of the ecosystem health community (e.g., water quality, habitat, living resources, etc.), the sectors (e.g., policy, planning, research, regulation, etc.), have good geographic distribution, and strive to contain various subject matter experts (e.g., coastal management, data collection and management, ocean observing, etc.) that are responsive to tasks in committee work plans. The intent is to have 20-30 members. Sub-committees, either standing or ad-hoc, may be formed as needed and contain individuals from the committee and outside of the committee.
3. **Committee support** - The organizations understand that the level of staff support the committee has affects the work of the committee and on progress on its objectives. Resources permitting the organizations will provide staff support to the committee in the form of in-kind contributions of time and project funding.
4. **Expectations of committee members** - Individuals that accept an invitation to serve on the committee are expected to actively participate in committee meetings and in committee activities between meetings.
5. **Committee meetings** - Meetings will be called as needed. It is expected there will be at least one in-person meeting a year. Significant work will occur between meetings.
6. **Methods of communication** - The committee will conduct its business by conference call, email, and occasionally in-person.
7. **Committee decisions** - A quorum of 51% of the members is necessary for decisions to be made. The committee will work collaboratively to develop a consensus position on issues that it needs to act on. The committee may decide to vote on specific issues but the results are non-binding on those that oppose or abstain from the decision.



Developing an Economic Model for Evaluation of Program and Organizational Success

The Working Group met with Dr. Robert J. Johnston of Clark University at the March WG meeting in Boston. The WG had previously contacted Dr. Johnson regarding the possibility of developing an economic assessment of the work of the various Council activities and programs. Dr. Johnson advised that an approach that would most effectively convey the value of our activities is a bio-geophysical model measurement that could provide a value of a healthy Gulf of Maine. A bio-geophysical model can assess the output of natural processes, habitats, and products over a large area. For example, when investigating the sources of methane gas the model can be used to assess methane emissions from natural wetlands by comparing it to known sources of methane. The end product would provide a unified message as to the economic value of the work undertaken by the GOMC.

At present, we only partly know the value of our investments in the Gulf of Maine. The direct value of our investments into programs and activities includes the direct dollars we are investing, the dollars we are leveraging, and the value of our products. Our programs and activities also provide a sustainability component to other values that have yet to be fully understood and quantified. These include the overarching value of healthy habitats and their direct benefit to a healthy fisheries sector and marine industries, ancillary industries and spin-off economies related to tourism, as well as the value of healthy communities. We also need to quantify for example, the value of infrastructure at risk to sea level rise and the impacts of climate change throughout the GOM watershed.

A cursory inventory of available sources of information points to existing economic reports, valuations, and studies, on such varied topics as aquaculture and fisheries, recreational activities, wetlands conservation, habitat restoration, stream restoration, infrastructure protection, etc. A formal gathering of this information by the WG can help us identify gaps and succinctly summarize existing economic analyses.

This is an opportune time for us to attempt to determine the overall value of the Gulf of Maine, with justification based on the value of protecting the activities, economies, livelihoods, social fabric, and culture of this coastal and marine entity. A bio-geophysical model measurement could generate sector specific valuations and reports that could highlight many of these assets. The Working Group requires guidance from Council as to what important economic questions need to be answered to quantify the value of the Council's work.

Submitted by Rob Capozzi, Working Group Chair and NB Department of Environment and Local Government and Steven Couture, NH Department of Environmental Services

Fundraising for the Council a summary of results between 2005-2012

Background: The Council supports its operations, ongoing programs and one-time activities through a variety of means including: agency contributions and dues (e.g. cash and services in-lieu of cash); partner and sponsor contributions on specific projects; and government and foundation grants which include indirect revenues. These resources may flow through either the Canadian and/or US Association. They may also go directly from a funder to support an activity (e.g., an agency contracts directly with an individual to perform a specific task, etc.). The largest ongoing source of support has been the NOAA/GOMC habitat restoration partnership (e.g., 11-years and \$4 million).

It is estimated that on an annual basis well over 70% of all Council cash and in-kind support results from federal/provincial/state agency personnel working internally to garner that support. (In-kind support is contributions of goods and services in lieu of cash.) This internal work by member agencies is a hallmark of the Gulf of Maine Council and a testament to the commitment of its member agencies.

In 2005, after significant Council discussion, the Council augmented its capacity to secure funding by soliciting and hiring a part-time fund development coordinator. Described below are the results of this work, lessons-learned that should inform future fund development work and a summary of the funds raised.

- A. A six-year overview of the results
- Expenses -- While annual amounts varied, over the past six and a half years (2005 and 2012) the Council has expended an average of \$27,000/year to develop proposals that implement Action Plan priorities.
 - Revenues -- The Council has received at least \$775,000 in cash (either in cash to the Council or organizations providing cash directly to a contractor) and \$25,000 in contributed staff time support flowing from the work of the fund development coordinator.
 - Sources of support -- The \$800,000 was provided by government, foundations, non-profits and academia. Amounts ranged from a low of \$3500 (Cox Foundation) to \$150,000 (GeoConnections) and \$285,000 (NOAA/Climate Change Program). Average awards were \$20-40,000.
 - Uses of funding -- Examples of how the funds were used include GOM Times, indicators, restoration, climate change, action planning, IT, etc. (Appended to this report is a 1-page summary of the uses of the funds, timing, sources and amounts.)
 - 4:1 Return on investment -- Approximately \$180,000 was spent to receive over \$800,000 in support of Council priorities.
- B. Lessons-learned
1. The annual contract review process should continue to occur (e.g., whether contractor deliverables and deadlines were attained, ways to improve approaches and conditions, etc.)
 2. An internal committee, consisting of Councilors and Working Group members that have fund development expertise, should be formed to advise the Council and Fund Development Coordinator. Further, fund development staff of the non-profit organizations represented on the Council should be periodically engaged/consulted with on Council funding needs, strategies and opportunities.
 3. External funders have made it clear that member agencies need to pay for internal, ongoing Council costs. Further, that the Council needs to provide matching funds when seeking external funder support.
 4. Thoughtful and competitive ideas form the basis of successful proposals. Rigorous committee work plans are essential for efficiently developing proposals. We know that developing and maintaining work plans is a challenge. Committees need to redouble their efforts to provide high quality work plans.
 5. Securing sponsors of the GOMT has proven to be effective but is time-consuming.
 6. It is more efficient to write larger proposals than multiple smaller proposals.
 7. Funders want to "share risk" with other funders and look for multi-partner proposals that leverage other resources. The Council needs to display significant leadership in cultivating and coalescing support for regional issues.
 8. Raising funds (and contributed staff time) to implement the Action Plan takes an organization wide commitment to securing the support to be successful. Expectations on the results/outcomes should be commiserate to the level of engagement by the Council, Working Group and committees.



Partial listing of \$800,000+ in cash raised and services secured in-lieu of cash: 2005 to 2012

There are three primary sources of support: cash raised and managed by the Association; cash provided by an organization and given directly to a contractor to perform a service for the Council; and staff time contributed to work on a Council project.

Summit follow-up - 2005 - DFO - \$5,000 (agency cash)
On-line monitoring program inventory - 2005 - UNH - \$20,000 (agency cash)
Federal - Provincial crosswalk - 2006 - EC - \$15,000 (agency cash)
Support development of indicators - 2006 - EPA - \$10,000 (cash to Council)
Support development of indicators - 2006 - NOAA - \$5,000 (cash to Council)
Support development of indicators - 2010 - NERACOOS - \$14,000 (cash to Council)
Develop GOM research priorities - 2005 - CSO - \$3,000 (cash to Council) - NOAA \$10,000 (staff time contributed)
ESIP start-up grant - 2007 - NRCAN/GeoConnections - \$150,000 (cash to Council)
ESIP - indicators work - 2006 - NOAA/CICEET - \$20,000 (cash to Council)
ESIP - indicators work - 2006 - NOAA/NCCOSS - \$3,000 (staff time contributed)
Science Translation - 2006 - NOAA/CICEET - \$40,000 (cash to Council)
Assessment of cumulative impacts of coastal permitting - 2007 - ELI - \$10,000 (staff time)
Indicators, web, science translation, and outreach - EPA - \$40,000 (cash to Council)
Business plan for GOMT - 2008 - NOAA - \$3,000; MCF - \$5,000; NHCF - \$5,000 (cash to Council)
Oceans planning integration effort - 2008 - DFO - \$10,000 (agency cash)
Gulf of Maine Times - 2009 - 2012 - GOMT sponsors \$25,700 (cash to Council)
Habitat restoration coordinator & restoration/conservation strategy planning - 2009 - Cox Trust \$60,000, MCF \$6,000, NHCF \$10,000 (cash to Council)
Information technology - 2009 - Cox Trust - \$3,500 (cash to Council)
Climate change research, communication and local grants - 2011 - NOAA - \$285,000 (cash to Council)
Action Planning - 2006 and 2011 - MSPO - \$30,000 (cash to Council)
SOE aquaculture theme paper - 2011 - NSF&A \$4,000 (agency cash)
SOE eutrophication theme papers - 2012 - EPA \$3,000 (staff time contributed)
Create digital GOM library & upgrade web site - 2012 - MSPO - \$4,500 (agency cash)

Submitted by David Keeley, Fund Development Coordinator

Core Services

Background

In 2008 an RFQ was issued for a Core Services Contract. Core Services include Fund Development, Council Coordination, IT and the Gulf of Maine Times. The Core Services contractor then subcontracted the four Core Services. As the needs of the Council evolve with the development of a new 5-year Action Plan for 2012 to 2017, the Core Services that support the Council need to evolve as well. This will entail review of the scopes of work to reflect the goals and objectives of the new Action Plan and to outline tasks and deliverables that will help the Council accomplish its goals and fulfill its mission.

The Management and Finance Committee (M&F) has recommended that the Core Services scopes need to be revised and that new RFQs need to be issued. In response to these recommendations, the scopes for each of the Core Services will be revised in line with the Council's needs and the 2012-2017 Action Plan, an RFQ will be issued for each service, and each service will be contracted directly with the Gulf of Maine Association under the purview of the Secretariat.

At the present time, a contract facilitator has been identified for three of the four core services (Fund Development, IT and GOM Times) to assist the Secretariat in contract management and offer technical advice on the tasks and deliverables provided by each contractor.

The Secretariat and M&F agreed that an RFQ for Fund Development would be published in July with the aim to have a new contract in place by September 1, 2012 at the latest. A draft scope and RFQ were developed and distributed to M&F for comments. Based on further discussions and comments provided on the funding needs of the Council however, further work needs to be done before issuing an RFQ. It is important to better understand the role of this service and the outcomes expected, and ensure that these are reflected in the scope and the RFQ. To this end the Secretariat (in consultation with M&F) will develop a scope and RFQ over the next months and issue an RFQ in October 2012. For the period July-December 2012 the contractor for Fund Development will be The Keeley Group.

Current status and next steps

- RFQs will be issued for each of these contracts, according to the following schedule:

Core Service	RFQ Issued	Contract Start Date
Fund Development	October 2012	January 1, 2013
Council Coordination	October 2012	January 1, 2013
GOM Times	October 2012	January 1, 2013
IT	April 2013	July 1, 2013

- Starting July 2012, the Secretariat, in consultation with M&F will identify desired outcomes for Fund Development and Council Coordination, and develop draft RFQs and scopes for tasks and deliverables in line with current Council needs and Action Plan goals.
- RFQs will be issued according to the schedule above.
- Secretariat Team reviews responses submitted for the RFQs and make recommendations to M&F.
- A similar process will start in January 2013 for IT services.

Action or outcomes requested

- Working Group provides suggestions for new/revised tasks and deliverables for the Fund Development and Council Coordination scopes.
- Working Group reviews schedule for RFQs and contracts for the four core services.

Submitted by Robert Capozzi, Working Group Chair



Migrating GOM hard-copy library to the digital age

Meeting the needs of priority users

Background

Since 1989 the Maine State Planning Office has served as the Council's repository for Gulf of Maine/Bay of Fundy publications. At present there are over 400 publications in the collection of which 100 +/- are estimated to be products of the Gulf of Maine Council. In early May the Coastal Program moved to new offices and no longer has space for the library. To ensure an orderly transition of the library to the digital environment it is supporting work to:

- Ensure priority publications remain available to the Council and the public; and
- Increase accessibility to Gulf of Maine print resources

This 3-4 month project has five steps including: understanding the contents of the library, exploring library partnerships to host elements of the collection, reducing the holdings to priority items, obtaining and creating digital copies of priority items, using the Council's *Knowledge-base* to make these publications accessible through an enhanced web presence on the Council's web site, and increasing awareness amongst users that these digital resources are available.

A cursory review of *Knowledge-base* users reveals they include government officials, academics and researchers, non-profit organizations, journalists/media, elected officials and members of the public. Since the purposes of Council publications are often on increasing awareness of target audiences and improving the management of coastal/ocean resources it is timely to ensure that the *Knowledge-base* search features enable priority users to access the resources they need.

The Working Group is representative of the region's coastal management community (e.g., managers, policy analysts, regulators, researchers, etc.). At the June meeting it will provide user insights about current and desired *Knowledge-base* search features.

Possible Activities and Next Steps

1. Review and become familiar with *Knowledge-base* through an interactive tour provided by Jennifer Hackett (DFO) and Jim Cradock (Yellahoose). (5-min)
2. Working Group identifies 2-3 desired resources (e.g., information on riparian buffers and setbacks, habitat restoration techniques, or seafloor mapping data). Using the *Knowledge-base* search features Jennifer/Jim leads them through a mock-exercise to locate the materials. (15-minutes)
3. Working Group members have a facilitated discussion about the search features and offer recommended improvements to better meet their needs. (15-minutes)

Working Group members are asked to bring web addresses of searchable databases that they use (and like) to the meeting.

Actions/outcomes requested

Members of the Working Group are aware of this digital transition, are knowledgeable about how to find resources that they can use in their daily work, and provide helpful user feedback to make *Knowledge-base* more useful.

Submitted: Theresa Torrent-Ellis, Maine Coastal Program