

# **GOMINFOEX PROJECT**

**SarahRose Werner**  
**Atlantic Coastal Action Program Saint John**  
**November 2, 2001**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

SCOPE OF PROJECT .....	1
PROCEDURES AND NOTES .....	1
RESULTS .....	3
GOMINFOEX LISTSERV .....	5
PARTICIPANTS MAP .....	5
GULF OF MAINE TIMES .....	6
CONCLUSIONS .....	7
APPENDIX A: Handouts for GOMINFOEX Action Committee Meeting, September 13-14, 2001 .....	9
APPENDIX B: Copies of Contact Material .....	14
APPENDIX C: Summaries of Results .....	19
APPENDIX D: Deletion Request Comments .....	21
APPENDIX E: GOMINFOEX Listserv Comments .....	22

## SCOPE OF PROJECT

This project is a follow-up to the Out of the Fog II conference held by the Gulf of Maine Information Exchange (GOMINFOEX) in cooperation with the Atlantic Coastal Action Program (ACAP) Saint John in Saint John, NB, November 2-4, 2000. Originally the project was conceived as involving three components: updating the People Finder Database (PFD), developing a web site review procedure, and doing other work to further the goals expressed at Out of the Fog II. However, updating the PFD ended up consuming so much time that little work was done on the remaining two components beyond the preparation of two handouts for a meeting of the GOMINFOEX Action Committee in Woods Hole, MA, September 13-14, 2001. These are included in Appendix A. One is a preliminary draft for a web site review process, and the other is a table documenting the use of Internet-based GOMINFOEX resources.

The remainder of this report will deal with the updates to the PFD during the period August through October, 2001.

## PROCEDURES AND NOTES

- ! I received a copy of the PFD from Allan Gillis as a delimited text file on August 9. The file contained a total of 9,520 records. Four of them were unusable:
  - N6640 — blank
  - NEWJOE3275 — contains text “The Registe” in the organisation field but no other information.
  - no code number — contains text “Stratham / NH / 03885-2403 / USA” in the title, last name, first name, and middle initial fields.
  - no code number — contains text “rst / full / notadmin / 1” in the code number, titles, last name, and first name fields.
  
- ! Of the remaining 9,516 records, 8,125 were flagged for full privacy, meaning that they would not be accessible to someone searching the PFD. 1,387 were flagged for no privacy, and for four records, the privacy field was blank. I decided to work on the 1,391 records which were flagged for no privacy or not flagged at all plus 19 records which were flagged for full privacy and had e-mail addresses, as records with e-mail addresses could presumably be confirmed relatively easily. A total of 1,410 records were targeted for confirmation.
  
- ! On August 18 1,150 preliminary e-mails were sent out to see if they bounced or not. (See Appendix B for a copy of the e-mail.) 843 were sent to e-mail addresses from the PFD. 140 (17%) of these bounced. 307 were sent to e-mail address found through the Internet and educated guesswork regarding the format of government agency addresses. 110 (36%) of these bounced. An additional five messages bounced with insufficient information to tell what addresses they'd been sent to in the first place. A total of 255 (22%) of the messages bounced. Valid alternate addresses were found for 53.

! As of September 10 the following first attempts had been made to confirm the information on the PFD.

- 916 e-mails with information to confirm were sent on August 28 and 29 and September 5 and 6. (See Appendix B for a copy of the e-mail.)
  - 252 letters were mailed on August 21 to people for whom e-mail addresses couldn't be found. (See Appendix B for a copy of the letter.)
  - 203 letters were mailed on August 24 to people whose preliminary e-mail messages bounced and to one person whose preliminary message had been sent to a different person with the same name who worked for the same government agency.
  - 18 letters were mailed on September 7 to people whose confirm information e-mail messages bounced.
  - 11 records were tagged for deletion because they were obvious duplicates of other records.
  - 7 people sent complete contact information in response to the preliminary e-mail.
  - 3 people requested to be or had representatives request that they be deleted in response to the preliminary e-mail. (One is deceased, one no longer works in the Gulf of Maine, and one gave no reason.)
- 1,410 TOTAL

! Corrections to the "live" PFD began on September 11. This process took longer than expected as it was limited by the speed of the Internet connection (a dial-up connection using a 28K modem). A great deal of time was spent waiting for information to be transmitted and received.

! By September 28, all of the contact information returned to date had been processed. 429 (47%) of the 916 people contacted by e-mail had not responded. 427 "second request" e-mails were sent. Two e-mails intended for members of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers could not be delivered to the server usace.army.mil, possibly due to the mobilization of troops in the States after September 11. It was discovered that three e-mail addresses that had been valid at the beginning of September had since become invalid.

! By September 28, 358 (76%) of the 473 people contacted by mail had neither responded, nor had their letters been returned by the post office as undeliverable. Of the original 473 addresses, 372 (79%) were in the States. It usually takes a first-class letter 8-9 days to get from Saint John to southern Maine. Because only five weeks were left on the contract, it was decided that there was time neither to put together a second mailing or to individually phone all 358 people. It seemed more efficient to concentrate on trying to reach people who did have e-mail addresses and on researching letters that had been returned as undeliverable.

! A minor set-back in the processing of incoming contact information occurred on or about October 5, when the "live" PFD file was accidentally overwritten by an older version. The file was restored on October 10 with a back-up created the night of October 2. All corrections done October 3-10 were re-entered.

- ! Research of letters returned as undeliverable began on October 11. Where phone and/or fax numbers were available, these numbers were tested to see if they were still in service and were used to try to contact the addressees of the letters.
- ! Another minor computer glitch seems to have occurred on or about October 26, necessitating the re-entry of all corrections done October 23-26. Four of these re-entries were done on October 28, and the rest were e-mailed to Allan Gillis for completion on October 30. Two new corrections were also e-mailed to Allan on October 30.
- ! As mentioned previously, 140 of the e-mail addresses originally given in the PFD proved to be invalid by August 18. A few of these addresses contained obvious typos. For 79 of these entries, no response was received when requests for contact information were sent by mail or to corrected e-mail addresses. However, it did not seem appropriate to allow the incorrect information to remain on the PFD. A list of 74 invalid e-mail addresses was sent to Allan Gillis on October 30 so that these addresses could be deleted from the related entries. Another five e-mail addresses were sent to Allan for correction.

## RESULTS

- ! Summary tables of the results are shown in Appendix C.
- ! Only 31% of the people contacted by e-mail did not respond. All of the people who did respond, did so by e-mail.
- ! 71% of the people contacted by mail did not respond. (It should be kept in mind that only one letter was sent, in comparison to two e-mails.) Of the people who did respond, 43% did so by fax, 35% by mail, 17% by e-mail, and 5% by phone.

It should be noted that the contact information request mailings did not include stamped, self-addressed envelopes to return the forms to ACAP Saint John, as most of the letters were going to the States and it was not possible to obtain American stamps in a timely fashion.

- ! 35 of the letters were returned by the post office. I was able to reach the addressees or their successors in office in 12 cases. 11 entries were corrected. One was deleted at the request of a corporate addressee as the particular branch of the company that was listed in the PFD no longer exists.

Of the remaining 23 entries, one had been corrected by someone else to a completely different address as of October 26. Six were corrected using information from web sites or, in one case, a reverse-listing Internet phone directory (Infobel). The other 16 were deleted because none of the contact information in the PFD was valid anymore and any copies of the

Gulf of Maine Times (GOMT) still being sent to these addresses were not reaching their intended recipients.

! Action was taken for 832 (59%) of the 1,410 entries. Of these 832, 68% were corrected in some way, 21% were verified, and 11% were deleted. Some correction consisted simply adding fax numbers, e-mail addresses, or web site URLs to existing information. In other cases, more extensive changes were needed. Addresses and phone numbers had changed, and in 100 cases, new contact names were supplied for an organization or position. In other cases, people responded with information about their new position in a different organization or agency.

! Of the 94 entries that were deleted:

- 33 duplicated other entries.
- 29 were so obsolete as to be useless for purposes of contacting the person or organization.
- 18 were deleted on request of the person named without any reason for the request being given.
- 2 referred to people who are now deceased.
- 12 were deleted for various other reasons, usually a change in professional activity.

Some of the comments received from people who requested that their entries be deleted are given in Appendix D.

! 13 new entries were created, in most cases at the request of people contacted to confirm existing entries. In a few cases, people appear to have heard about the PFD from colleagues who received confirmation e-mails or letters.

! In eight cases records were corrected on the basis of information obtained from web sites (see page 20). More use might have been made of this technique if there had been time. However, information obtained from web sites must be evaluated carefully. Large government web sites may be updated regularly. They can be particularly useful for obtaining current addresses and phone numbers when an entire department moves, as happened in the case of the Massachusetts Executive Office of Environmental Affairs.

Web sites for smaller organizations and compilations of contact information for these organizations are less likely to be updated on a regular basis. The address given for the Falmouth Associations Concerned with Estuaries and Saltponds (FACES) in the WHOI Sea Grant directory was the same as the address that had already bounced back to me from the Falmouth MA post office.

## **GOMINFOEX LISTSERV**

! 251 people expressed interest in the GOMINFOEX listserv or said that they were already on it.

- ! A list of 242 people, edited to remove people whom I knew were already on the listserv, was sent to Lesley Carter on October 25. Three more responses that trickled in were sent to Lesley on October 26, October 30, and November 2.
- ! The major concern voiced about the listserv was that the volume of e-mail might be overwhelming. (See Appendix E.) One person was concerned about viruses, and a few people had concerns about cost.
- ! One respondent wrote, “I think we’ll pass on the list serve for now as we are on 2 other list serves and our e-mail traffic is already pretty heavy. We’d love to let folks know (especially Canadian) that our Mr. and Mrs. Fish Program is a wonderful resource available to them. Any thoughts on how we could use the project to communicate that?”

This comment and a few others may suggest a need for some sort of central electronic bulletin board or information clearing house.

## **PARTICIPANTS MAP**

- ! 225 people expressed interest in the Participants Map (PM) or said that they were already on it.
- ! This was in spite of the fact that one of the two URLs given for the PM in the contact information requests was incorrect. It was brought to my attention on October 31 that the URL should have been <http://www.e-atlas.org/pfmap.htm> rather than <http://www.e-atlas.org/pfmap.html>.

In fact, I did receive several responses from people saying that they were not able to access the URL as listed. My impression was that the E-Atlas URL was not yet active, so I referred them to the second URL given in the contact information requests, <http://www.spatial.maine.edu/~schroedr/gom/participants.html>.

- ! A list of 209 people, edited to remove people whom I knew were already on the map, was sent to Paul Schroeder on October 25. Two more responses that trickled in were sent to Paul on October 30 and November 2. (In a phone conversation on September 6, Paul had indicated that he would prefer that the information be sent to him directly rather than having me send it through the PM site.)
- ! The major question voiced about the PM was that people were unsure of its purpose.
  - “Don’t really know what it implies to be on the GOMINFOEX Participant’s Map.”
  - “What would be required of us?”
  - “Not sure of the purpose for the map, so no thanks.”

- ! One person felt that her organization could not accurately be assigned to one mappable point. “We don’t really have a ‘location’ that you could assign to GOMMEA, as we have members from Maine to Massachusetts.”
- ! A few people had concerns about cost.

## **GULF OF MAINE TIMES**

- ! “Thank you for the informative newsletter!” wrote one respondent.
- ! A list of 32 people who had either requested a change in the number of copies of the Gulf of Maine Times they receive or said they were having difficulties with delivery was sent to Andi Rierden and Allan Gillis on October 29. (The list was sent to Allan because although I could specify the number of copies of the Times to be delivered when creating a new record, I could not modify the number of copies for an existing record.)
- ! At least 12 people asked for more copies of the Times; one specified that the extra copies were for board distribution.
- ! 16 people asked for fewer copies of the Times. 10 of these people requested that no copies be sent to them. Four of these 10 mentioned that copies were circulated in their workplace and they read them there.
  - “Others in office receive and circulate it as well.”
  - “I get bulk copies here and they don’t need to waste the postage sending me an individual copy.”
  - “Copies are circulated internally.”
  - “We receive multiple copies that are circulated in our Section. I’m happy to give up my copy to save some paper.”
- ! In 2 cases, it was unclear from the copy of the PFD received in August whether the number of copies of the Times requested represented an increase or a decrease.
- ! 2 people expressed delivery difficulties. One wrote, “Somehow, the Times hasn’t been making it to the above address; I’d like to receive it.”

## **CONCLUSIONS**

Most of the responses that were received to the requests for contact information seemed to range from neutral to positive. One respondent wrote:

“I believe it’s important to keep contact. Please note our new section on BMPs in soil conservation and on-farm case study.”



A few other respondents also included information on their current areas of study. It was a bit frustrating not to be able to forward these on to sort of central information clearing house.

44% of the “target audience” did not respond. It’s only possible to guess at their reasons for failing to do, but the following are possibilities:

- ! Lack of time and/or interest. This is the most obvious and probably the most common reason.
- ! Some people may not have received the contact information request e-mailed to them. Not every e-mail server bounces invalid addresses, especially not free-mail servers such as hotmail.com and yahoo.com.
- ! Some people may not have received the contact information request mailed to them even though the form was not returned by the post office. Letters delivered by the post office to an addressee who’s no longer at that address may simply be discarded by the current occupants. This might especially apply to small organizations whose contact address was a member’s home address or post office box.
- ! At least one person wanted to be deleted and thought that this would happen automatically if he didn’t respond. This confusion could have been avoided through more precise wording on the contact information request.
- ! A few people reacted to the request by editing their own entries on the PFD.

If the Action Committee decides to encourage people listed in the PFD to update their own entries rather than having a third party do so, the Committee must still address issues such as lack of time/interest and the obsolescence of contact information if they want to maintain the currency and usefulness of the PFD.

Suggestions can also be made for improvements to the PFD itself. The inability to edit the number of copies of the Gulf of Maine Times for existing records — even for one’s own record — has already been mentioned.

Another useful improvement would be to “repair” the date field so that when someone creates or edits an entry, the date of the modification would be automatically entered in this field and would be displayed to anyone browsing the PFD. This would give users some idea as to the currency and relative usefulness of the contact information.

Finally, the title field seems to default to “Ms.” for all entries. In at least two cases, this led to people being addressed by inappropriate titles on their contact information requests. Although this is not a serious problem, it would nice if it could be repaired.

## APPENDIX A:

### Handouts for GOMINFOEX Action Committee Meeting, September 13-14, 2001

#### WEB SITE REVIEW PROCESS, SEPTEMBER 10, 2001

(Extremely preliminary draft)

- A. What questions need to be asked about sites? Suggestions:
1. How long does the opening page of the site take to download? Do large graphic files make it slow and encourage users to surf on to another site before downloading is complete?
  2. Is the site set up to facilitate both random browsing and searches for specific information?
  3. Is the site bilingual and is this a concern in Gulf of Maine watershed?
  4. Who does the site appear to be aimed at? Students (elementary, secondary, college/university, graduate), academic & government scientists, other government policy makers, community action groups, fishermen? Others?
  5. How accessible/useful is the site to groups other than its primary target?
  6. Are the links on the site (to other sites and to e-mail addresses) up to date?
  7. Quality of information:
    - a. How frequently is the information updated?
    - b. What quality controls are applied to the information being presented?
    - c. How is the user informed about a & b?

*“Many participants felt that some kind of quality control mechanism was needed; at a bare minimum, users should know where information comes from so that they can make our own decisions about its credibility.” (OOTF2 Final Report, page 5.)*

8. Is information available for saving/download? How? (Download a file, save as HTML or TXT file, save graphic images, etc.)

*“The third issue discussed with regard to data access was that of policy and ownership decisions that need to be made when an organization contemplates sharing its information. The necessity to prepare guidelines/codes of ethics to protect proprietary information was stressed by several participants.” (OOTF2 Final Report, page 5.)*

- B. A standardized form for reviewers needs to be developed. It should have space for comments, but as much as possible use multiple choice answers.
- C. How is the form to be distributed to and returned by the reviewers? It seems a poor use of technology to have them print out the form and then fax or mail it in. Is it possible to develop the form as an HTML file with fill-in fields? To collect the forms at the GOMINFOEX web site? Use FormMail (<http://www.worldwidemart.com/scripts/formmail.shtml>)?

- D. Who's going to be in charge of collecting the results from the forms and making sure they get to the web site authors? Would it be simpler to have the forms available at a central site where the authors can go and read them directly? But does this create the possibility of suppression of opinions by reviewers to avoid conflict?
- E. We need to identify people who are interested in acting as reviewers and people who are interested in having their sites reviewed.
- F. We need to create a process for periodic replacement of the reviewers so that no one feels as if they have to make a life-long commitment.

**PARTICIPATION IN INTERNET-BASED GOMINFOEX RESOURCES, AUGUST 9, 2001**

ID #	Participants' Map	GOMINFOEX as Keyword	GOM Discussion Forum		Mailing Groups (13)	
	a/o Aug 9 '01	a/o Aug 9 '01	Nov 2 '99 to Aug 9 '01		a/o Aug 9 '01	
				# messages		# groups
01	yes					
02			yes	1		
03	yes					
04	yes	yes			yes	7
05	yes	yes	yes	14	yes	11
06	yes	yes				
07	yes					
08	yes					
09	yes					
10					yes	2
11	yes					
12	yes					
13	yes					
14	yes					
15	yes		yes	1		
16	yes	yes				
17					yes	3
18	yes	yes				
19			yes	1		
20			yes	2		
21			yes	1		
22					yes	3
23					yes	2
24			yes	1		
25	yes					
26	yes					
27	yes					
28		yes				
29	yes					
30			yes	1		
31	yes					
32		yes				
33		yes				
34					yes	1
35			yes	1		
36					yes	1
37	yes					
38		yes				
39	yes					
40	yes		yes	12		

ID #	Participants' Map	GOMINFOEX as Keyword	GOM Discussion Forum		Mailing Groups (13)	
	a/o Aug 9 '01	a/o Aug 9 '01	Nov 2 '99 to Aug 9 '01	# messages	a/o Aug 9 '01	# groups
41	yes					
42	yes					
43	yes					
44					yes	8
45	yes					
46			yes	1		
47			yes	1		
48			yes	1		
49	yes					
50	yes					
51	yes					
52	yes					
53	yes					
54	yes					
55			yes	1		
56					yes	3
57		yes				
58	yes					
59	yes					
60		yes				
61	yes		yes	1		
62	yes					
63			yes	1		
64			yes	1		
65	yes					
66	yes					
67	yes					
68	yes					
69	yes					
70	yes					
71			yes	1		
72	yes					
73					yes	1
74					yes	1
75			yes	1		
76	yes					
77					yes	2
78	yes					
79	yes	yes				
80			yes	3		
81	yes					
82	yes					

ID #	Participants' Map	GOMINFOEX as Keyword	GOM Discussion Forum		Mailing Groups (13)	
	a/o Aug 9 '01	a/o Aug 9 '01	Nov 2 '99 to Aug 9 '01		a/o Aug 9 '01	
				# messages		# groups
83	yes					
84	yes					
85			yes	1		
86			yes	1		
87		yes	yes	4	yes	6
88					yes	1
89			yes	3		
90			yes	1		
91			yes	1		
92					yes	2
93	yes					
94					yes	3
	52	13	26	58	17	57
			Year 1999	6		
			Year 2000	29		
			Year 2001	23		

## **APPENDIX B: Copies of Contact Material**

### **PRELIMINARY E-MAIL SENT AUGUST 18, 2001:**

Greetings! The Gulf of Maine Information Exchange (GOMINFOEX) is in the process of updating the contact information in the People Finder database. This a preliminary message sent to test the validity of this e-mail address. In the next few weeks, you'll be receiving an individualized message with contact information which you will be asked to confirm or correct.

GOMINFOEX is a cooperative effort of federal, state, and provincial governments, environmental non-governmental institutes and agencies, university researchers, K-12 educators and commercial interests to promote and help find, access and make use of environmental information in the Gulf of Maine. Their vision is to maximize the benefits to coastal communities of the Gulf of Maine from environmental information. More information on the people, activities, aims and history of GOMINFOEX can be found at <http://www.gulfofmaine.org/gominfoex>.

The Atlantic Coastal Action Program (ACAP) Saint John is currently assisting GOMINFOEX in updating the People Finder database, an on-line tool that people interested in the Gulf of Maine can use to locate and communicate with each other (<http://www.gulfofmaine.org/cdb/index.html>).

There is no need to respond to this preliminary message, but if you have any questions or would like more information, please feel free to contact me at ACAP Saint John.

Regards,  
SarahRose Werner  
[acapsj@fundy.net](mailto:acapsj@fundy.net)  
<http://user.fundy.net/acapsj>

ACAP Saint John  
76 Germain Street  
PO Box 6878 Stn A  
Saint John, New Brunswick  
E2L 4S3

**SAMPLE OF E-MAILS SENT AUGUST 28 AND 29 AND SEPTEMBER 5 AND 6, 2001:**

The following is the contact information we currently have associated with this e-mail address in the GOMINFOEX People Finder database. Please reply to this e-mail either to confirm that this information is correct or to let us know that what corrections are necessary. **THANK YOU!**

SarahRose Werner  
Atlantic Coastal Action Program (ACAP) Saint John

**CONTACT INFORMATION**

Mr. Sean Brilliant  
Executive Director  
ACAP Saint John  
76 Germain Street  
PO Box 6878, Station A  
Saint John NB E2L 4S3  
Canada

Phone number(s): (506) 652-2227  
Fax number: (506) 633-2184  
E-mail address: [acapsj@fundy.net](mailto:acapsj@fundy.net)  
Web site: <http://user.fundy.net/acapsj>

Number of copies of the Gulf of Maine Times I wish to receive: 1

- 1) Is the above information is correct?
- 2) If not, what changes need to be made?
- 3) Would you like to be added to the GOMINFOEX listserv to receive information on GOMINFOEX meetings, documents and activities via e-mail and to participate in e-mail discussions with other GOMINFOEX members?
- 4) Would you like to be added to the GOMINFOEX Participant's Map (<http://www.e-atlas.org/pfmap.html> or <http://www.spatial.maine.edu/~schroedr/gom/participants.html>)?

ACAP Saint John is currently assisting GOMINFOEX in updating the People Finder database, an on-line tool that people interested in the Gulf of Maine can use to locate and communicate with each other (<http://www.gulfofmaine.org/cdb/index.html>). If you have any questions or would like more information about this project, please contact SarahRose Werner at ACAP Saint John.

ACAP Saint John  
76 Germain Street  
PO Box 6878 Stn A  
Saint John, New Brunswick  
E2L 4S3

phone: (506) 652-2227  
fax: (506) 633-2184  
[acapsj@fundy.net](mailto:acapsj@fundy.net)  
<http://user.fundy.net/acapsj>



**LETTER AND SAMPLE OF CONTACT INFORMATION FORMS MAILED AUGUST 21, AUGUST 24, AND SEPTEMBER 7, 2001:**

Greetings!

The Atlantic Coastal Action Program (ACAP) Saint John is currently assisting the Gulf of Maine Information Exchange (GOMINFOEX) in updating the People Finder database, an on-line tool that people interested in the Gulf of Maine can use to locate and communicate with each other (<http://www.gulfofmaine.org/cdb/index.html>).

We'd like to request a few minutes of your time to check the information on the enclosed contact data form and let us know if it's correct or if there are changes we need to make. You can get in touch with us by e-mail, fax, regular mail, or phone.

GOMINFOEX is a cooperative effort of federal, state, and provincial governments, environmental non-governmental institutes and agencies, university researchers, K-12 educators and commercial interests to promote and help find, access and make use of environmental information in the Gulf of Maine. Their vision is to maximize the benefits to coastal communities of the Gulf of Maine from available environmental information. More information on the people, activities, aims and history of GOMINFOEX can be found at <http://www.gulfofmaine.org/gominfoex>.

If you have any questions about GOMINFOEX or the People Finder database, please let me know.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Regards,

SarahRose Werner



## CONTACT INFORMATION

Mr. Sean Brilliant Executive Director ACAP Saint John 76 Germain Street PO Box 6878, Station A Saint John NB E2L 4S3 Canada	Phone number(s): (506) 652-2227 Fax number: (506) 633-2184 E-mail address: <a href="mailto:acapsj@fundy.net">acapsj@fundy.net</a> Web site: <a href="http://user.fundy.net/acapsj">http://user.fundy.net/acapsj</a>
Number of copies of the Gulf of Maine Times I wish to receive: 1	

**YES**, the above information is correct.

**NO**, the following changes need to be made:

**YES**, I would like to be added to the GOMINFOEX listserv to receive information on GOMINFOEX meetings, documents and activities via e-mail and to participate in e-mail discussions with other GOMINFOEX members.

**YES**, I would like to be added to the GOMINFOEX Participant's Map (<http://www.e-atlas.org/pfmap.html> or <http://www.spatial.maine.edu/~schroedr/gom/participants.html>).

**Please return this information to ACAP Saint John by:**

- 1) E-mailing us at [acapsj@fundy.net](mailto:acapsj@fundy.net) with "Attn: Sarah" in the subject field.
- 2) Faxing this form to us at (506) 633-2184.
- 3) Mailing this form to ACAP Saint John, PO Box 6878 Stn A, Saint John NB E2L 4S3.
- 4) Phoning us at (506) 652-2227. Between 10 AM and 4 PM Atlantic Time, Monday-Friday, ask to speak to Sarah.

**THANK YOU!**

**APPENDIX C: Summaries of Results**

METHOD OF RESPONSE	METHOD OF CONTACT*					TOTALS
	NOT SENT	E-MAIL	FAX	MAIL	PHONE	
NO RESPONSE, NO ACTION**	0	280	0	298	0	578
NO RESPONSE, ACTION**	11	4	0	25	0	40
E-MAIL	0	645	1	23	0	669
FAX	0	0	0	57	0	57
MAIL	0	0	0	46	0	46
PHONE	0	0	0	6	14	20
TOTAL NO RESPONSES #	11	284	0	323	0	618
TOTAL NO RESPONSES %	100%	31%	0%	71%	0%	44%
TOTAL RESPONSES #	0	645	1	132	14	792
TOTAL RESPONSES %	0%	69%	100%	29%	100%	56%
OVERALL TOTALS	11	929	1	455	14	1,410

\* In many cases, more than one method of contact was attempted. For cases in which contact was made, the method of contact used for this table was the one that finally produced results. For cases in which contact was not made, the method of contact used for this table was the initial one.

\*\* In some cases where there was no response, the entry was corrected or deleted on the basis of other information:

11	records deleted without contact information requests being sent because they were obvious duplicates of other records.
2	records deleted after the e-mail addresses and phone numbers (one for a NOAA employee, the other for a University of New Hampshire employee) were discovered to be obsolete.
1	record corrected using information from the Government of New Brunswick web site.
1	record discovered to duplicate another after a contact information request had already been e-mailed.
4	SUBTOTAL
16	contact information requests returned by post office; records deleted after determining that all contact information was obsolete.
7	contact information requests returned by post office; 5 records corrected using information from web sites, 1 record corrected using information from a reverse-listing phone directory (Infobel), and 1 record corrected by someone else.
2	records corrected using information from the Government of Massachusetts web site.
25	SUBTOTAL

METHOD OF RESPONSE	ACTION				TOTALS
	NO ACTION	CORRECTED	VERIFIED	DELETED	
NO RESPONSE, NO ACTION*	578	0	0	0	578
NO RESPONSE, ACTION*	0	10	0	30	40
E-MAIL	0	454	165	50	669
FAX	0	49	4	4	57
MAIL	0	36	5	5	46
PHONE	0	13	2	5	20
OVERALL TOTALS	578	562	176	94	1,410
% OF OVERALL TOTAL	41%	40%	12%	7%	100%
% OF TOTAL ACTED ON	---	68%	21%	11%	---

\* In some cases where there was no response, the entry was corrected or deleted on the basis of other information:

5	contact information requests returned by post office; records corrected using information from web sites.
1	contact information request returned by post office; record corrected using information from a reverse-listing phone directory (Infobel).
1	contact information request returned by post office; record corrected by someone else.
2	records corrected using information from the Government of Massachusetts web site.
1	record corrected using information from the Government of New Brunswick web site.
10	SUBTOTAL
16	contact information requests returned by post office; records deleted after determining that all contact information was obsolete.
1	records deleted without contact information requests being sent because they were obvious duplicates of other records.
2	records deleted after the e-mail addresses and phone numbers (one for a NOAA employee, the other for a University of New Hampshire employee) were discovered to be obsolete.
1	record discovered to duplicate another after a contact information request had already been e-mailed.
30	SUBTOTAL

## **APPENDIX D: Deletion Request Comments**

### **SAMPLES OF REQUESTS DUE TO OBSOLETE INFORMATION:**

“The person listed below has not worked with the company in 4-5 years. We do not really need to receive the information in the Marketing Department... You can delete the name and subscription below.”

“I know she used to work here but I’ve never met her. She hasn’t worked here for over five years. We don’t have an outreach program anymore.”

### **REQUESTS DUE TO CHANGE IN PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY:**

“Given that I don’t work on the GOM, but work exclusively on the Eastern Scotian Shelf, please remove me from this database.”

“The info you have on me is old and mouldy, but it’d be best to just remove me altogether as I am not pursuing seaweed work presently.”

“We are closing NEFDA effective this month and I will be focusing on other seafood related projects.”

“I am no longer involved with work in New England.”

“I have changed regions to the Great Lakes, and no longer work in the Northeast.”

“I am no longer active in science. Only my brain works now.”

“I am no longer with Oceans and would prefer not to be on your mailing list.”

“I have retired and no longer represent the agency reported by your system. The office was closed and there was no replacement.”

“I am no longer involved in this activity.”

### **OTHER REQUESTS:**

“OSOS is in the process of disbanding. You may remove us from your list.”

“Please remove my name from your Gulf of Maine mailing list. The Departmental Library receives copies of GOM publications which can be viewed at any time.”

“Save a stamp, save a tree. Please remove me from your mailing list. Too much to read, too little time.”

## APPENDIX E: GOMINFOEX Listserv Comments

“I do not wish to be placed on the listserv, only because we have experienced problems with the transmission of electronic viruses via other listservs.”

“As I retire after I return from vacation, I’ve decided to begin cutting down on the incoming material, both paper and electronic. Accordingly, I’ll not be wanting to be added to the GOMINFOEX listserv, or to be added to the GOMINFOEX Participant’s Map.”

“I am trying to keep abreast of Gulf of Maine activities, but am not an active GOM researcher. Accordingly I don’t want to be entered on the listserv or participant’s map.”

“I’m not sure that inclusion on the GOMINFOEX listserve is a good idea. I can’t keep up with the ones I’m already on. When I am really needed for work or consultation about GOM plankton (my specialty), people know where to call.”

“No time for a listserv at this time.”

“We probably wouldn’t use the list serve much now... perhaps in the future.”

“YES, provided, however, that getting off the listserv is easy (in case the load becomes too great).”  
*(Note: this person later asked to subscribe to the listserv after the unsubscription process was explained.)*

“Depends on volume; once a week or less would be okay. Any more would be too much.”

“No — there’s too much information to process all of it. I don’t need to sort through any more e-mails than I already get!!”

“Only if limited contact... Prefer to look at a website with listings.”

“Please keep the e-mails down to a minimum.”

“I would like notification about the events, but probably would not take part in the e-mail discussions.”

Received on a contact information form returned in the mail:

“YES, I would like to be added to the GOMINFOEX listserv to receive information on GOMINFOEX meetings, documents and activities via e-mail ~~and to participate in e-mail discussions with other GOMINFOEX members.~~” *(Phrase on form crossed out by respondent.)*