



**Council Meeting**  
**Monday, December 15, 2014**  
***10:00 AM – 1:00 PM ET***  
***11:00 AM – 2:00 PM AT***

**Briefing Book**

**Conference Call Access Information**

Call In: 1 888-206-2266

Passcode: 5764669

## **Table of Contents**

<b>Meeting Agenda .....</b>	<b>3</b>
-----------------------------	----------

### **Consent Agenda**

- DRAFT Record of Decisions from June 2014 Council Meeting .....	4
- ESIP and the Delivery of Ecosystem Indicators .....	9
- Climate Network Activities (including King Tides) .....	11

### **Action Agenda**

- Proposed Gulf of Maine Proclamation .....	13
- GOMA Financial Update and Audit .....	14
- GOMA / GOMC Fund Development Update .....	15
- GOMC Organizational Assessment	
Leadership Options .....	17
Option of Combining WG / Council .....	19
Results from Facilitated Sessions at October 2014 Working Group Meeting .....	21
Links to Additional GOMC Organization Assessment Reference Documents .....	30

**Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment**  
December 15, 2014 • Council Meeting • Briefing Book

<b>GOMC Council Meeting</b> <b>Agenda • Monday, December 15, 2014</b> <b>10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. ET / 11:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m. AT</b>		
10:00 AM ET	<b>Welcome, Introductions, and Overview of Objectives for the Meeting</b> <i>Steve Couture, Working Group Chair</i> <i>NH Department of Environmental Services</i>	
10:10 AM	<b>Consent Agenda</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft Record of Decisions, June 2014 Council Meeting, pp. 4-8</li> <li>ESIP and the Delivery of Ecosystem Indicators, pp. 9-10</li> <li>Climate Network Activities (including King Tides), pp. 11-12</li> </ul>	✓ For Decision  pp. 4-12
10:15 AM	<b>Proposed Gulf of Maine Proclamation – June 2015</b> Susan Russell-Robinson and the 25 <sup>th</sup> Anniversary Committee request feedback from Council regarding a proposal to culminate the GOMC 25 <sup>th</sup> Anniversary year with a Gulf of Maine Proclamation and celebratory event.	✓ For Decision  p. 13
10:30 AM	<b>GOMC / GOMA Financial and Fund Development Updates</b> Cindy Crum will provide an update regarding GOMA/GOMC financial status and audit (pp. 14), and fund development (pp. 15-16).	✓ For Information ✓ Internal  pp. 14-16
11:00 AM	<b>GOMC Organizational Assessment: GOMC Leadership Options</b> Steve Couture and Joan LeBlanc will provide an update regarding the GOMC organizational assessment, including feedback and recommendations from the November 2014 Council Advisory Committee (CAC) and the October 2014 Working Group meeting. Council is asked to provide feedback and direction to WG and CAC for next steps in pursuing strategies for restructuring GOMC leadership.	✓ For Information ✓ Internal ✓ For Direction  pp.17-18
12:00 PM	<b>GOMC Organizational Assessment: Combining WG and Council</b> Steve and Joan will present feedback from the November Council Advisory Committee and October Working Group meeting regarding the option of combining Working Group and Council into one entity. Council is asked to provide direction to WG and CAC regarding this structural option.	✓ For Direction  pp. 19-20
12:45 PM	<b>Next Steps and Plans for June 2015 Council Meeting</b>	✓ For Direction
1:00 PM	<b>Adjourn</b>	

## Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment

December 15, 2014 • Council Meeting • Briefing Book

---

### DRAFT Record of Decisions • GOMC Council Meeting • June 18, 2014 • Halifax, Nova Scotia

#### Meeting Participants

**Council Members:** Jennifer Anderson, NOAA Marine Fisheries Service (via conference call); Priscilla Brooks, Conservation Law Foundation; Mel Cote, US Environmental Protection Agency; Terry Holman, US Department of the Interior; Don Hudson, The Chewonki Foundation; Kim MacNeil, Nova Scotia Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture; Geoff Mercer, Environment Canada; David Millar, Department of Fisheries and Ocean; Ru Morrison, NERACOOS; Lorrie Roberts, Nova Scotia Environment; and Lee Sochasky, New Brunswick.

**Others participants:** Bill Appleby, Environment Canada; Heather Breeze, Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada; Rob Capozzi, New Brunswick Department of Environment and Local Government; Steve Couture, New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services; Sophia Foley, NS Department of the Environment; Tim Hall, Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada; Cindy Krum, GOMA Executive Director; Jim Latimer, US Environmental Protection Agency; Joan LeBlanc, GOMC Council Coordinator; Ellen Mecray, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; Slade Moore, Maine Coastal Program; Rebecca Newhall, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; Kathryn Parlee, Environment Canada; Christophe Rivet, Environment Canada; Ann Rodney, US Environmental Protection Agency; Susan Russell-Robinson, US Geological Survey/ US Department of the Interior; Theresa Torrent, Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry; Prassede Vella, Massachusetts Office of Coastal Zone Management; Peter Wells, Dalhousie University/Bay of Fundy Ecosystem Partnership; and Bill Whitman, Nova Scotia Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture.

#### Opening Remarks

Lorrie Roberts, Executive Director of Policy, Nova Scotia Environment welcomed participants, outlined objectives for the meeting and asked participants to introduce themselves.

#### Consent Agenda

The following consent agenda items were accepted:

- December 2013 Council meeting summary acceptance
- GOMA Report (Financial and Fund Development Summary)
- GOMC Fund Development Report
- GOMA Contractor Fee Report
- State of the Gulf of Maine Update
- ESIP Committee Update

The following items were removed from the consent agenda:

- GOMC 25<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Update
- GOMC Plans for 2014-2015 NH Secretariat Year
- GOMC / GOMA Website Upgrade

#### Record of Decision for June 2014 Council Meeting

Council members approved recommendation by Lorrie Roberts that Council Coordinator prepare a brief record of decisions document instead of a more detailed meeting summary for the June 2014 and future Council meetings.

#### Climate Change Presentation and Discussion

Bill Appleby provided an update regarding the state of the region's climate and major trends. Key points included:

- Impacts of climate change in the Gulf of Maine are on the rise with climate fast becoming the most powerful ecological and economic driver for the region
- Waters in the GOM are warming faster than 99.9 percent of the global oceans
  - Increased temperatures have implications for the whole ecosystem

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

December 15, 2014 • Council Meeting • Briefing Book

---

- Billion dollar climate disasters on the rise
- Extreme precipitation events have increased by 74% in the Northeast
- Sea level rise in the Northeast is expected to exceed global averages
- States, provinces and local communities are struggling to respond and adapt to the impact of climate change on coastal resources and infrastructure
- Challenge is to get decision makers to focus on benefits of rebuilding infrastructure to reduce future risks

Ellen Mecray highlighted ongoing and planned activities of the GOMC Climate Network, including

- Expanded GOMC webpage with community toolkits, case studies, and other resources
- A new bi-national, quarterly Gulf of Maine Region Climate Impacts and Outlook
- Ongoing development of a climate information dashboard with links to real time data
- Continued upgrades to the NeclimateUS.org (NExUS) online database
- Recent completion of a study of municipal climate adaptation strategies around the Bay of Fundy
- Expanded outreach for GOMC Climate Network products

Council members expressed support for the products and services being developed by the Climate Network, particularly the GOM region quarterly outlook.

### **Financial Status – Context for Strategic Planning**

Lorrie Roberts highlighted financial picture to provide background and setting for GOMC strategic planning discussions. Following an economic downturn, reduced Council funding and limited staff capacity among Council member organizations underscore the need to reevaluate and streamline how the Gulf of Maine Council operates.

- Council members agreed that GOMC has value but making jurisdictional commitments is difficult with reduced budgets and competing priorities.
- Some Council members noted that providing financial contributions toward restoration or other projects that support jurisdictional priorities is easier to justify than providing dues for GOMC core operations.
- Funding for regional and international travel is increasing difficult to justify.

Cindy Krum provided a brief status report regarding GOMA / GOMC budget and fund development efforts. Key points included:

- Predicted expenditures for the fiscal year July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014 are \$1,768,225. Estimated unrestricted net asset balance is estimated to be \$119,659 on June 30, 2014.
- The operating budget for FY July 2014 through June 2015 is \$1,075,086 (GOMC portion of the budget is \$292,670 and the fiscal agent portion of the budget is \$782,416).
- Prediction for FY July 2015 through June 2016 budget is \$530,704.
- GOMC budget has been expanded with non-Council projects due to RARGOM and NROC commitments. As NROC projects come to a close, GOMC budget will continue to decline.
- Jim Boyle prepared a fund development report highlighting several recommended strategies for future GOMC fund development. Jim recommended creation of a mitigation endowment concept as the best option for future operating support for GOMA / GOMC.
- GOMA board recently recommended that the GOMC no longer pursue foundation grants as the bulk of the GOMC's work is more 'government' oriented and not conducive to funding from foundations. This decision follows research and communications with foundations made by Jim Boyle.
- GOMA approved a three month plan for Jim Boyle to continue working on non-foundation fund development activities through September 2014 at no additional cost.

### **25<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Activities**

Council members expressed their support for the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary activities and noted that these activities have helped to increase awareness and understanding of the GOM and GOMC. Councilors noted that the awards ceremony and GOMC special session were particularly effective. Activities have included: a 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary

publication, special GOMC session at Coastal Zone Canada, GOMC Awards Ceremony, GOMC display and bookmarks, a multimedia presentation, and a geocaching event.

Lee Sochasky provided an update on key feedback and results from the GOMC Special Session held during Coastal Zone Canada 2014. In addition to panelists, 46 people attended the session (60% government / 40% non-profit) and 16 feedback cards were received. Key points of feedback included:

1. The Council is best at providing bi-national collaboration and overarching sharing of resources and information (ESIP, workshops, etc.).
2. GOMC needs to adapt to today's technological changes by increasing use of social media to share information and influence change.
3. GOMC should focus on engaging youth with experiential activities to help promote long-term environmental stewardship.
4. Need to focus on linking benefits of protecting the environment with human health and economic benefits.

### **GOMC Strategic Planning Session**

GOMC Council members participated in a strategic planning session to discuss organizational structure, role of Council, priority focus areas, and other issues associated with charting the future direction for the GOMC. Joan LeBlanc provided additional background for the strategic planning session and summarized results from interviews with Council members conducted during the spring of 2014. Based upon feedback from those calls, there was a general consensus among Council members regarding the need to begin conducting self-assessment and strategic planning at the June 2014 meeting. A summary of priorities for developing a strategic vision and other feedback from the spring interviews is included in the June 2014 Council Meeting Briefing Book, pp. 28-31.

The following key decisions and priorities were identified by Councilors during the June 2014 strategic planning session.

### **Reaffirmed GOMC Founding Purpose (1989)**

- To enable the region's governments to be more effective stewards
- To sustain strong partnerships
- To integrate watershed, coastal, and ocean management

### **Key Priority Areas of Focus**

Following a discussion regarding jurisdictional priorities, several key shared priority areas of focus for GOMC were identified. While there was consensus regarding five broad topic areas, the more specific categories within each topic varied by jurisdiction.

1. Climate Change (impact and response)
  - Climate adaptation and sustainability
  - Coastal and community resilience
  - Climate Network
  - Impact on fisheries
  - Tracking / Forecasting
  - Weather ready nation
2. Water Quality
3. Habitat Protection
  - Living marine resources
  - Species at risk
  - Aquatic invasives
  - Fisheries habitat
  - Wetlands protection
4. Ecosystem Health
  - Ocean acidification

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

December 15, 2014 • Council Meeting • Briefing Book

---

- Impact of microplastics
- Impacts to offshore + inshore
- 5. Education and Outreach
  - Educate next generation about environmental stewardship for Gulf of Maine
  - Improve GOMC communications

### **Priority Types of Work for GOMC**

Council members identified the following two top priority types of work that the Council should continue to focus on within a streamlined environment:

1. Networking / Multi-Jurisdictional Collaboration and Facilitation
2. Sharing Resources/ Best Practices/ Capacity Building (regional or jurisdictional)

While a small number of Council members identified 'facilitating the delivery of products and information tools' as an important activity, this type of work was not selected as a top priority for the Council. Environmental monitoring was also not selected as a priority activity or type of work for a streamlined Council.

### **Key Action Items for GOMC Strategic Planning**

Council members identified the following two key actions to be pursued during the 2014-2015 Secretariat Year.

- GOMC will conduct an organizational assessment with a focus on making the organization more streamlined and strategic.
- GOMC will develop recommendations for pursuing the two shared priority types of work.
  - Working Group and Council Advisory Committee will assess existing programs and committees against agreed upon priority types of work

### **Overarching Themes for GOMC Organizational Assessment**

Council members recommended that efforts to streamline and reorganize should ensure that GOMC is:

- Able to make a difference, 'in the game'
- Strategic
- Decision-based
- Reflective of jurisdictional priorities
- Relevant
- Effective
- Able to adapt to changing needs

### **GOMC Plans for 2014-2015 NH Secretariat Year**

- Council approved the following interim meeting structure for the 2014-2015 New Hampshire Secretariat Year to enable capacity for organizational / strategic planning
  - Council will have only one in-person meeting
  - Working Group will meet three times
  - Management and Finance Committee will meet on a quarterly or as needed basis
  - Secretariat Team calls will be scheduled on an as needed basis
  - GOMC Awards program will be temporarily placed on hold due to budget constraints and a shift in the GOMC Council Coordinator's work plan to focus on strategic planning efforts. Awards were identified as a priority by some Council members and may be reconsidered if funding is identified.
  - Meeting plans for 2014-2015 will be flexible to ensure adequate Council feedback and involvement throughout the year (additional conference calls / virtual meetings will be scheduled if needed)

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

December 15, 2014 • Council Meeting • Briefing Book

---

- An Ad-hoc Strategic Planning Committee made up of Council members will be convened to provide direction and assist with strategic planning and organizational assessment throughout year
- Existing GOMC Action Plan, projects, and committees will remain in effect during organizational assessment year
- Working Group will follow up on limited opportunities for funding with a priority focus on pursuing a special designation for the Gulf of Maine
- Steve Couture and Joan LeBlanc will develop a draft scope for the organizational assessment with input from the new advisory committee

### **GOMC Website Upgrades**

Prassede Vella provided an update via briefing note regarding ongoing efforts to revamp the GOMC website with a cleaner, more user-friendly, streamlined site. Prassede has been working with Jim Cradock and GOMC committees to complete this project. While the new website is now up and running, some operational aspects and content are still being updated. Lee indicated that she would follow up with Prassede regarding questions that prompted removing this item from the Consent Agenda.

*Record of decisions prepared by Joan LeBlanc, GOMC Council Coordinator.*



<b>Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment Meeting Briefing Note</b>					
<b>Title of Agenda Item:</b> ESIP and the Delivery of Ecosystem Indicators					
<b>Submitted by:</b> Kathryn Parlee (Environment Canada) and Jim Latimer (Environmental Protection Agency) ESIP Co-Chairs					
<b>Type of Item</b> (place X in appropriate box)	<b>For Decision</b>	<b>For Direction</b>	<b>For Information</b> (internal GOMC)	X	<b>For Information</b> (External)
<p><b>Background</b> (required):</p> <p><u><b>Introductory Video</b></u></p> <p>In October ESIP released a new video to promote its activities and efforts in supporting Goal 2: Environmental and Human Health of the Gulf of Maine Council's Action Plan. The short 3-minute video introduces visitors to ESIP's current on-line tools and other valuable materials for communicating information on monitoring activities (Goal 2.1) and tracking the trends in environmental conditions in the Gulf of Maine (Goal 2.2). The video also acknowledges the importance of partnerships and collaboration throughout the ESIP community. The video has already been watched by almost 200 people and is a great way to find out what ESIP is accomplishing in the Gulf of Maine/Bay of Fundy.</p> <p>To get a quick update on ESIP's activities and products for yourself, you can watch the video either on ESIP's main page (<a href="http://www.gulfofmaine.org/esip">www.gulfofmaine.org/esip</a>) or directly on YouTube at: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OXyhCLktqsc#t=33">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OXyhCLktqsc#t=33</a>.</p> <p><u><b>ICUC App</b></u></p> <p>With funding from USGS, ESIP has started a new project to build a smart phone application – the ICUC app ("I See You See" app). This app will support ESIP's activities to compile and share data (Action Plan Goal 2.1) and to communicate about existing monitoring (Action Plan Goal 2.2) in the Gulf of Maine. The app will encourage people in the Gulf of Maine and Bay of Fundy region to learn about monitoring taking place and to submit images at specific locations throughout the region. From any location in the region the ICUC app will link into ESIP's Monitoring Map to inform users about monitoring in their vicinity. It will also enable users to capture images which their smart phones can georeference and then submit them to a photographic library which will help to demonstrate impacts and changes in the region over time.</p> <p><u><b>ESIP Phase 2 - Directional Committee</b></u></p> <p>This year ESIP will be completing our initial indicator phase which has been successful in determining indicators to look at the current state of the Gulf of Maine and Bay of Fundy. These critical indicators take a giant first step forward in tracking the trends in environmental conditions in the Gulf of Maine (Goal 2.2). We have begun to look at indicators that bring together a deeper understanding of the Gulf of Maine ecosystem by utilizing integrative and/or ecosystem service indicators. A Directional</p>					



## Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment

December 15, 2014 • Council Meeting • Briefing Book

---

Committee of ecosystem experts from multiple levels of government (federal, state/provincial) and academia in both Canada and the U.S. has been established and tasked with creating a framework for these integrative and/or ecosystem service type indicators as part of ESIP 2.0. Look for some announcements and requests for participation in this new phase in early 2015!

**Possible Activities / Next Steps** (optional):

Councilor and Working Group assistance will be requested at the June 2015 meeting. ESIP would like to include agency priorities when determining the ESIP 2.0 indicators.

**Actions, Outcomes or Decisions Requested** (optional):

Not at this time.

**Supporting Documentation** (If applicable, list additional documents included in the Briefing Book following this Briefing Note):

<b>Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment Meeting Briefing Note</b>					
<b>Title of Agenda Item:</b> Climate Network Activities (including King Tides)					
<b>Submitted by:</b> Ellen Mecray and Bill Appleby, Climate Network Co-Chairs					
<b>Type of Item</b> (place X in appropriate box)	<b>For Decision</b>	<b>For Direction</b>	<b>For Information</b> (internal GOMC)	X	<b>For Information</b> (External)
<p><b>Background</b> (required):</p> <p>The <a href="#">GOMC Climate Network</a> has launched a quarterly e-bulletin that incorporates the <a href="#">Gulf of Maine Region Climate Impacts and Outlook</a> (being developed and distributed by a bi-national team, supporting an MOU established by NOAA and EC). The bulletin currently goes electronically to more than 300 people around the region (and more recipients are signing up at the GOMC website). The <i>Outlook</i>, featured on the Climate Network web pages and distributed to the press, provides a snapshot of recent weather events and anomalies; discusses weather impacts on the region's ecosystems and economy; and provides a forecast for the coming three months. In addition to the <i>Outlook</i>, the <a href="#">Climate Network e-bulletin</a> includes notice of climate-related events, tools and reports. The GOMC Climate Network is helping to publicize the availability of the <i>Outlook</i>, and will gather feedback—in its upcoming e-bulletin—from <i>Outlook</i> readers to determine which features are most valuable and what future changes they would like to see.</p> <p>The GOMC site now includes a <a href="#">climate information dashboard</a> that provides multiple links to recent and real-time data sources (<i>e.g.</i>, temperature, precipitation, stream flow, drought, sea temperature, sea wave height, snow, soil temperature, heat stress forecasts, and storms). The Climate Network led efforts to compile the dashboard data sets and will be publicizing this new resource more in coming months. Working with more than a dozen partner organizations throughout the region, the Climate Network took the lead in planning and coordinating the first-ever <a href="#">Gulf of Maine King Tides Photo Contest</a>, held region-wide October 9, 2014. This event generated more than 150 images of an exceptionally high “King Tide,” helping area residents and communities envision impacts of sea-level rise. A gallery of images is now online (see <a href="http://gulfofmaine.kingtides.net/2014/08/28/featured-event-october-9-2014/">http://gulfofmaine.kingtides.net/2014/08/28/featured-event-october-9-2014/</a>), and the images can be reused (giving credit to the photographers listed) for educational purposes. The King Tides Photo Contest received good press throughout the region, as these examples demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">‘King Tide’ seen as test for rising seas</a>, <i>Gloucester Times (MA)</i>, 10/3/2014</li> <li>• <a href="#">King tide provides a glimpse into the future</a>, <i>WCSH TV (ME)</i>, 10/9/14</li> <li>• <a href="#">Photo contest focuses on high tide</a>, <i>Chronicle Herald News (NS)</i>, 10/7/14</li> </ul> <p>The Climate Network received a foundation grant to coordinate this effort and to facilitate a sea-level rise demonstration project in Portland, Maine. Students from the University of Southern Maine worked this fall with the Climate Network, a coastal geologist, and the City's Student Art Committee to demarcate a 3-foot sea-level-rise along a 4.1-mile cycling/walking trail. The educational art installation created by the students will open December 8 and remain up through the first “King Tide” of 2015 on January 22. The Climate Network expects more press on the Trail in coming weeks, but there have already been two articles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Student art exhibit along two Portland trails envisions the effects of rising sea level</a>, <i>Portland Press Herald</i>, 11/25/14</li> <li>• <a href="#">USM students hope Portland trail creates a wave of awareness about sea-level rise</a>, <i>The Forecaster</i>, 12/1/2014</li> </ul>					

## Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment

December 15, 2014 • Council Meeting • Briefing Book

---

In October, the GOMC Climate Network submitted a grant proposal to NOAA's COCA Program seeking funding for a regional project involving climate, public health and risk preparedness. Planned in conjunction with partners at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), CDC's state BRACE (Building Resilience against Climate Effects) programs, the Northeast Regional Climate Center (NRCC) and other partners, the project would create targeted alerts for coastal populations that are highly vulnerable to extreme heat and heavy precipitation. In November, the GOMC Climate Network submitted a grant proposal under Environment Canada's Atlantic Ecosystems Initiative for a project that would involve collaborative, cross-border work to create a web-based tool offering improved access to Intensity/Duration/Frequency (IDF) extreme rainfall data, helping environmental managers and municipal planners better prepare for climate impacts in Atlantic Canada.

**Possible Activities / Next Steps** (optional):

Funding decisions on the NOAA grant are expected in Spring/Summer 2015. Funding decisions on EC's AEI proposals are expected in Spring 2015. The Climate Network will be seeking renewed foundation funding this winter to continue its successful Gulf of Maine King Tides Project.

**Actions, Outcomes or Decisions Requested** (optional):

None required.

**Supporting Documentation** (If applicable, list additional documents included in the Briefing Book following this Briefing Note):

NA

<b>Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment Meeting Briefing Note</b>						
<b>Title of Agenda Item:</b> Celebrating the Gulf of Maine – proposed proclamation in June 2015						
<b>Submitted by:</b> Susan Russell-Robinson and the 25 <sup>th</sup> Anniversary Committee						
<b>Type of Item</b> (place X in appropriate box)	<b>For Decision</b>	x	<b>For Direction</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 5px;"> <b>For Information</b> (internal GOMC)                         </td> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 5px;"> <b>For Information</b> (External)                         </td> </tr> </table>	<b>For Information</b> (internal GOMC)	<b>For Information</b> (External)
<b>For Information</b> (internal GOMC)	<b>For Information</b> (External)					
<b>Background</b> (required):						
<p>Gulf of Maine Council members were amazed by the question posed by a teenage panelist at the CZC 2014 Special Session in June 2014: “Why do I not see information about the importance of the Gulf of Maine and its wonderful resources on social media?” The ensuing discussion drove home the point that many people are unaware of the resources and location of the Gulf of Maine and of the need to support the vitality of this relatively unimpaired water body and associated watersheds.</p> <p>How can the Council to raise visibility and motivate action? How will the Council leverage contact with Premiers and Governors to discuss need for special designation of the Gulf of Maine as a region of special interest to conserve good water quality while supporting multiple uses?</p>						
<b>Possible Activities / Next Steps</b> (optional):						
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Proclamation of Gulf of Maine Day June 17, 2015: A joint resolution of the Premiers of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and the Governors of Maine, Massachusetts and New Hampshire. This resolution (modeled after the 2001 Year of the Gulf of Maine Proclamation) would tie in with the June 2015 GOMC face-to-face meeting. It would be timed to coincide with a culminating event for the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of GOMC and to tie to World Oceans Day (June 8, 2015).</li> <li>(2) Resolution of Support by the Federal Partners of GOMC: This document will reinforce recognition of shared responsibility for maintaining and enhancing environmental quality of these shared ecosystems and reaffirm commitment of federal partners to work with states and provinces to protect the ecosystems of the Gulf of Maine.</li> <li>(3) GOM Councilors: Discussion of what announcement or action would occur at June 17, 2015 meeting as a culminating event for GOMC 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary.</li> </ol>						
<b>Actions, Outcomes or Decisions Requested</b> (optional):						
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Approval to proceed with development of Proclamation and Resolution of Support.</li> <li>(2) Identification of appropriate parties to work with on developing acceptable language and to brief Premiers, Governors, and federal agencies’ leaders</li> <li>(3) List of 2 or 3 suggestions for culminating 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary event (in New Hampshire).</li> </ol>						
<b>Supporting Documentation</b> (If applicable, list additional documents included in the Briefing Book following this Briefing Note):						
<p>See GOMC Action Plan 2001-2006, pages 6 &amp; 7  <a href="http://www.gulfofmaine.org/council/action_plan/action_plan2001-06.pdf">http://www.gulfofmaine.org/council/action_plan/action_plan2001-06.pdf</a> </p>						

<b>Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment Meeting Briefing Note</b>					
<b>Title of Agenda Item:</b> GOMA Financial Update and Audit					
<b>Submitted by:</b> Cynthia Krum					
<b>Type of Item</b> (place X in appropriate box)	<b>For Decision</b>	<b>For Direction</b>	<b>For Information</b> (internal GOMC)	X	<b>For Information</b> (External)
<b>Background</b> (required):					
<p><b>1. Financial Update</b></p> <p>A <i>GOMA Financial Report and Operating Budget and Six-Month Contractor Scopes of Work</i> documents are available in the Meeting section of the GOMC website. Below is a brief description of the documents available for informational purposes.</p> <p><u>Budget vs. Actual Report</u></p> <p>This document shows expenses compared to budget in the current fiscal year.</p> <p><u>July 2014 - June 2015 Revised Operating Budget and July 2015 - June 2016 Budget Prediction</u></p> <p>In June, 2014 the fiscal year July 2014 - June 2015 Operating Budget was approved by GOMA and was provided to Council for informational purposes. The revised Operating Budget, already reviewed by the GOMC Management and Finance Committee, will be presented to GOMA on December 16, 2014. The total revised budget amount is \$1,350,681 (including fiscal agent funds). Budget predictions for future fiscal years are included in this document.</p> <p><u>Six-Month Contractor Scopes of Work</u></p> <p>For cash flow reasons the Council Coordinator, Information Technology Specialist, GOMA Executive Director and GOMA Finance Manager received 6 month contracts. The document provided includes the Scopes of Work for January 1, 2015 – June 30, 2015 for these four contractors.</p> <p><b>2. GOMA Audit</b></p> <p>An annual independent audit has been completed for fiscal year July 2013 – June 2014. The unrestricted net assets at June 30, 2014 were \$119,043. This slightly exceeds the recommended amount of at least one month of operating expenses. The management and administrative rate at the end of the prior fiscal year, June 30, 2013 was 18.14%. The new rate at the close of fiscal year, June 30, 2014 is 14.45%. The audit and administrative rate will be reviewed and acted upon at the Gulf of Maine Association meeting on December 16, 2014. The new administrative rate will go into effect on December 17, 2014 on new grant proposals and contributions.</p>					
<b>Actions, Outcomes or Decisions Requested</b> (optional): None at this time.					
<b>Supporting Documentation</b> (If applicable, list additional documents included in the Briefing Book following this Briefing Note): GOMA Financial Report and Operating Budget and Six-Month Contractor Scopes of Work are available on the GOMC website at: <a href="http://www.gulfofmaine.org/2/gomc-home/council-meetings/">http://www.gulfofmaine.org/2/gomc-home/council-meetings/</a>					

<b>Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment</b> <b>Meeting Briefing Note</b>					
<b>Title of Agenda Item:</b> GOMC / GOMA Fund Development Update					
<b>Submitted by:</b> Cynthia Krum					
<b>Type of Item</b> (place X in appropriate box)	<b>For Decision</b>	<b>For Direction</b>	<b>For Information</b> (internal GOMC)	X	<b>For Information</b> (External)
<b>Background</b> (required):					
<u>Federal Funding Proposals</u> There have been four federal funding proposals submitted since the last Council meeting in June. A brief description of each proposal is below. The full proposals are available in the additional document section of the Gulf of Maine Council website meeting page.					
Environment Canada Gulf of Maine Initiative Proposals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ecosystem Indicator Partnership (ESIP): <i>Monitoring to understand human impacts on the health of the Gulf Maine system</i></li> </ul> For most of the indicators used in ESIP there is excellent data available for the Bay of Fundy. However, major data gaps exist for critical indicators of human impacts on the health and viability of the Bay of Fundy. These gaps make it difficult to compare the Bay of Fundy region to other regions or to the Gulf of Maine as a whole. Through targeted sample collection and analysis in the Bay of Fundy, this project will provide data on eutrophication (nitrogen and phosphorus concentrations, water clarity and chlorophyll <i>a</i> ) and on human-derived contaminants in sediments, information which is critical for assessing the current health of the Gulf of Maine. Most importantly, without data on how human impacts are affecting the Bay, it will become increasingly difficult to <b>responsibly</b> analyze the cost/benefits of coastal development in relation to habitat conservation and <b>sustainable</b> ecosystem health in the Bay of Fundy and the Gulf of Maine. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gulfwatch: <i>Monitoring selected chemicals of emerging concern in mussels in the Bay of Fundy</i></li> </ul> In this proposed project, the focus will be on selected CECs (chemicals of emerging concern) in mussel tissues, chemicals not previously analyzed in the Gulfwatch program, but known to be in the ecosystem from studies with marine mammals and fish (herring), and unstudied at lower trophic levels. There are many CECs of great concern and risk in coastal ecosystems – they include organotins, alkylated PAHs, toxaphene, personal care products, various endocrine disrupters, PBDEs, PFCs, pyrethroid pesticides, PPCPs, etc. It is the opinion of the Gulfwatch team that the group should measure the standard EPA chemicals less frequently now and initiate a program concentrating on a selection of such CECs, the preferred ones to start with being toxaphene and PBDEs. Hence a small subset of tissue samples from the Bay of Fundy sites, each year for two years, will be analyzed for these two analyte categories, and the data compared to levels found in marine organisms in other coastal areas. If possible, depending upon the analytical techniques employed (e.g. GC-MS), data on other CECs of interest may be obtained.					
Environment Canada Atlantic Ecosystem Initiative proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Climate Network: <i>Increasing climate risk preparedness, water quality management and flooding control by enhancing planning use of intensity/duration/frequency rainfall data</i></li> </ul> This project involves collaborative work to create a web-based tool offering improved access to Intensity/Duration/Frequency (IDF) extreme rainfall data, helping environmental managers and municipal planners better prepare for climate impacts in Atlantic Canada. Both municipal leaders in Atlantic communities (in a 2014 survey supported by HOTO) and provincial planners have voiced a need for better tools to strengthen planning and to manage water quality, stormwater and flooding during frequent and intense extreme precipitation events. To enhance their risk preparedness, they need ready access to precipitation data, including IDF curves, in a user-friendly online format.					
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Climate Program Office proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Climate Network: <i>Building resilience in vulnerable coastal populations of the Northeast</i></li> </ul>					

## Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment

December 15, 2014 • Council Meeting • Briefing Book

To assess and address risks associated with both heatwaves and extreme precipitation, public health officials require gridded climatological data that aligns with county-level and census tract health information. This project, proposed under NOAA's COCA Program—*Supporting Resilient Communities and Ecosystems in a Changing Climate*, will provide mapped data and test methods of issuing climate alerts to vulnerable populations. It will integrate and expand existing climate alliances in the Northeast, bringing together federal, state, county, academic and nonprofit partners in an unprecedented climate and health partnership.

### James Boyle, Fund Development Coordinator Update

Jim Boyle's last day of contractual work for the Gulf of Maine Association was September 30, 2014. Following are a few final suggestions:

A) Follow up with Park Foundation regarding LOI to support GOMA in pursuing Mitigation funding. During first week of August 7 LOI's were submitted to seven foundations. Park Foundation requested additional information and responded that they would consider the LOI. Cindy Krum has contacted them to determine if they have made a decision and is awaiting a response.

B) GOMA should mail the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary publication with a cover letter to environmental attorneys working in Attorneys General Offices, enforcement directors of state environmental conservation agencies, or the EPA. He recommended that the cover letter state "we represent scientists and officials from all states and provinces along the Gulf of Maine, the only such organization, and we stand ready to assist in data gathering and convening of scientists regarding any major pollution threats, or assist in remediation efforts." The Working Group at the October meeting decided that they did not recommend this action at this time.

### Project Development

Slade Moore was contracted to develop a report - *CoastWise Road Crossings: Scoping a Project Plan for Gulf of Maine Regional Needs*. During the month of October he was in touch with representatives from all five Jurisdictions to gather information. His report will be reviewed and next steps will be suggested by the GOMC Working Group on December 17, 2014.

### **Actions, Outcomes or Decisions Requested** (optional):

None at this time.

### **Supporting Documentation** (If applicable, list additional documents included in the Briefing Book following this Briefing Note):

Four federal funding proposals are available in the meeting section of the GOMC website at:

<http://www.gulfofmaine.org/2/gomc-home/council-meetings/>



<b>Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment Meeting Briefing Note</b>					
<b>Title of Agenda Item:</b> GOMC Organizational Assessment: Activities Since June 2014 Council Meeting and Leadership Options					
<b>Submitted by:</b> Steve Couture and Joan LeBlanc					
<b>Type of Item</b> (place X in appropriate box)	<b>For Decision</b>	<b>For Direction</b>	x	<b>For Information</b> (internal GOMC)	x
<b>For Information</b> (External)					
<b>Background</b> (required): <b>Direction from the June 2014 Council Meeting</b> During a strategic planning session at the GOMC June 2014 Council meeting in Halifax, Nova Scotia, Council provided the following direction:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ GOMC will conduct an organizational assessment during the 2014-2015 Secretariat Year.</li> <li>➤ A Council Advisory Committee (subset of the Council) will be convened to meet throughout the year to provide direction to the Working Group and Council Coordinator for the organizational assessment.</li> <li>➤ Working Group Chair and Council Coordinator will develop a draft scope for the organizational assessment.</li> <li>➤ Ongoing GOMC programs, fund development activities, committees, and action plan priorities will continue in their current form during the organizational assessment year.</li> <li>➤ Recommendations for GOMC organizational changes will be considered at the June 2015 meeting.</li> <li>➤ Council identified the following two highest priority 'types of work' that GOMC should continue to focus on within the framework of a streamlined organization. Working Group was directed to assist with identifying opportunities (via existing or new activities) to implement these priority types of work.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Networking / Multi-jurisdictional Collaboration and Facilitation</li> <li>2. Sharing Resources / Best Practices / Capacity Building (regional or jurisdictional)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>					
<b>GOMC Organizational Assessment – Progress Since June 2014 Council Meeting</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ At the June 2014 meeting, Working Group members participated in a facilitated session to identify Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats associated with the GOMC. A summary of the session has been prepared and reviewed by Working Group, and the Council Advisory Committee. This information helped to inform the scope of the organizational assessment and is providing useful information to inform the organizational assessment throughout the year.</li> <li>➤ At the June 2014 meeting, Working Group members participated in a facilitated session to identify opportunities for pursuing the two priority 'types of work' identified by Council. A summary of the session has been prepared and reviewed. Information from this exercise is being used to inform the organizational assessment. Because these opportunities were prepared with a broad directive to put ALL options on the table, the list needs to be prioritized.</li> <li>➤ Lee Sochasky and Susan Russell-Robinson prepared a summary of the GOMC 'Voices of the Gulf' session held as part of the Coastal Zone Canada 2014 conference. Results from the session provide useful insights regarding future direction for the GOMC from an outside, public perspective.</li> </ul>					

- Steve Couture and Joan LeBlanc developed a scope and timeline for the organizational assessment. Feedback from the Council Advisory Committee and the Working Group were incorporated into final versions of the scope and timeline.
- Joan LeBlanc developed a webpage for Council Advisory Committee meeting materials, and reference or historic GOMC documents related to the organizational assessment. This online resource area is being updated regularly throughout the assessment year. <http://www.gulfofmaine.org/2/gomc-home/council-advisory-committee-2014-2015/>
- The Council Advisory Committee convened and met during August 2014 to provide direction regarding the scope and timeline for the organizational assessment. During the August meeting, the Council Advisory Committee identified GOMC leadership and structure as the first order of business for the organizational assessment.
- At the direction of the Council Advisory Committee, Joan LeBlanc and Steve Couture worked with the Secretariat Team to develop potential options related to GOMC leadership and structure for discussion and consideration at the September Council Advisory Committee meeting.
- During the September 2014 meeting, the Council Advisory Committee provided direction for the Working Group to assist with evaluating the potential option of combining the Working Group and Council into one entity, and fleshing out four potential options for restructuring GOMC leadership.
- At the October 2014 Working Group meeting, WG members participated in break-out sessions to identify opportunities and constraints associated with the following four potential options for restructuring GOMC leadership during the October 2014 Working Group meeting.

Option 1 – No Action, Retain Existing Leadership

- Jurisdictional government members provide leadership of Council
  - Leadership rotates – one jurisdiction per year
- Federal partners, scientific community members, NGOs, and tribal representative are active participants at the Council table
- Council membership
  - Jurisdictions (2 government representatives each, + 2 non-government )
  - Federal Agencies (1 representative each)
  - Scientific community (2 representatives – 1 US / 1 Canadian)
  - Tribal representative (1)

Option 2 – State / Provincial and Federal Partner Joint Leadership

- Jurisdictional and federal agencies would co-lead Council
- US / Canadian shared leadership
- Rotating leadership
  - US State and Canadian Federal
  - Canadian Provincial and US Federal
- Council membership remains the same

Option 3 – State/Provincial, Federal Partners, and NGOs Share Leadership

- Leadership shared amongst three entities
  - US / Canadian balance (rotational basis)
  - NGOs elect their own leadership
- Balance amongst NGOs (Canadian and US)
- Council membership remains the same

Option 4 – Network Approach

- GOMC would act as a network where all agencies could be at the table
- Members could include state / provincial reps, federal agencies, non-profit organizations, academia, and others

*Key Working Group Recommendations*

After identifying constraints and opportunities associated with each option, WG reached consensus regarding several recommendations.

- WG does NOT support the Network Approach
  - This option is not a leadership model but rather an approach to be applied to other leadership models
  - Several valuable WG suggestions can be applied to other leadership models
- WG does NOT support Shared Leadership (Jurisdictional / State + Fed + NGOs)
  - WG recommends that NGO role within GOMC should be assessed to maximize opportunities for working together
- WG recommends further consideration of Shared Leadership (Jurisdictional / State + Fed)
  - Several concerns and issues would need to be addressed
- WG recommends further consideration of maintaining Existing Structure (Jurisdictional / State leadership)
  - Many opportunities for improvement can be pursued
- Regardless of leadership structure:
  - Co-chaired, shared leadership is needed to lighten the load
  - Leadership periods should be extended (and potentially overlap) to promote continuity
  - Leadership period should coincide with action plans
  - Involve NGOs and scientific advisors in committee and project work

*Key Council Advisory Committee Recommendations*

The Council Advisory Committee met during November to consider feedback and recommendations from Working Group and determine which options to move forward for consideration at the December 2014 Council Meeting.

- The Council Advisory Committee concurred with the Working Group's recommendations regarding leadership options.

**Actions, Outcomes or Decisions Requested:**

Council members are asked to determine if they support WG / Council Advisory Committee recommendations, or recommend an alternative approach to pursue for the second half of the NH Secretariat Year.

**Supporting Documentation** (If applicable, list additional documents included in the Briefing Book following this Briefing Note):

*\* Opportunities and constraints for each leadership option, as identified during the Working Group break-out sessions, are included in a summary document located on pages 21 to 29 of this Briefing Book.*

<b>Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment Meeting Briefing Note</b>				
<b>Title of Agenda Item:</b> GOMC Organizational Assessment – Combining Working Group and Council				
<b>Submitted by:</b> Steve Couture and Joan LeBlanc				
<b>Type of Item</b> (place X in appropriate box)	<b>For Decision</b>	<b>For Direction</b>	x	<b>For Information</b> (internal GOMC)
				<b>For Information</b> (External)
<b>Background</b> (required):  At the direction of the CAC, Working Group members participated in break-out sessions at their October 2014 meeting to identify the advantages and disadvantages associated with the potential option of combining Working Group and Council into one entity.  <i>Key Recommendations from Working Group:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ WG does <u>NOT</u> support proposal to combine Working Group and Council into one entity<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Need to maintain Council or similar high level entity as separate body to ensure high level buy-in / support for GOMC work</li><li>○ Goals of streamlining and promoting efficiency can be achieved by rethinking how and why the Council meets</li><li>○ Council provides vision and high level priorities / Working Group does the work</li></ul></li></ul> <i>Key Recommendations from CAC</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ Council Advisory Committee concurs with Working Group. The need for high level buy-in, streamlining and promoting efficiency, setting priorities, and conducting work of the Council need to be addressed regardless of whether Working Group and Council remain as separate entities or are combined.</li></ul>				
<b>Actions, Outcomes or Decisions Requested:</b> Council members are asked to recommend whether or not to further consider combining Working Group and Council into one entity. Council members are also asked to provide direction regarding preferred strategies for how and why the Council meets in the future.				
<b>Supporting Documentation</b> (If applicable, list additional documents included in the Briefing Book following this Briefing Note):  <i>All of the advantages and constraints associated with combining Working Group and Council that were identified during the Working Group facilitated session are summarized in a separate summary document located on pages 21 to 29 of this Briefing Book.</i>				

**Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment / Organizational Assessment  
Results from Facilitated Sessions at October 2014 Working Group Meeting**

---

**Background**

The Gulf of Maine Council is conducting an organizational assessment during the 2014-2015 Secretariat Year in an effort to streamline operations and promote efficiency. A Council Advisory Committee (CAC) was convened to provide direction for the organizational assessment. The CAC asked the Working Group to assist with evaluating the potential option of combining the Working Group and Council into one entity, and fleshing out four potential options for restructuring GOMC leadership. During the two day October 2014 Working Group meeting in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, Working Group members participated in two facilitated sessions to evaluate these options.

---

**Session 1 – Evaluate Option of Combining Working Group and Council**

Working Group members participated in break-out sessions to discuss the advantages and disadvantages associated with the potential option of combining Working Group and Council into one entity.

*Key Recommendations:*

- WG does NOT support proposal to combine Working Group and Council into one entity
  - Need to maintain Council or similar high level entity as separate body to ensure high level buy-in / support for GOMC work
  - Goals of streamlining and promoting efficiency can be achieved by rethinking how and why the Council meets
  - Council provides vision and high level priorities / Working Group does the work

*Summary from Breakout Session:*

Advantages of Combining WG / Council

- More efficient use of people's time, especially WG members who sit in for Councilors
- Would allow opportunity for more relevant experts to sit at the table
- Streamlines and makes decision making easier
- Promotes continuity in conversations
- Empowering for persons at the table
- Allows one point person from the table to reach out to a broader audience
- One group should reduce the number of process and communication steps/actions
- If composed of high-level members from organizations/agencies, should see re-engagement
- Having Councilors and Working Group members together as a unit could increase ownership
- Opportunity to renew and expand membership in the Council
- One forum for meeting or engaging makes decision to attend or not attend much easier
- If restructured to focus on implementing action plan elements, will be an organization of doers

- Break the loop of Working Group asking Councilors for direction or approval, only to have Councilors toss back to Working Group, who then pass on recommendations to Councilors who are different composition who then ask Working group to study again or more or whatever ... And on goes the loop

#### Constraints that would need to be addressed

- GOMC reps need buy-in from the top
  - Participants may not have opportunity or authorization to make decisions
  - Members need to have ability to make decisions about what resources they can bring to the table
  - Need to determine who has the authority to represent or speak for the jurisdiction
  - Need senior level involvement to ensure political support
- Councilors need to specify jurisdictional priorities
- Need to identify topics and regional priorities first in order to determine who the appropriate people at the table would be
- ‘Cookie cutter’ solution is tough because all of our agencies are different
- Combining would reduce the checks and balances of existing structure
- Challenge in determining what professional level members should be / how to ensure consistent level of leadership among members
- Combined entity doesn’t allow high level members to have staff support / or staff level members to have buy-in
- Need to figure out the appropriate size of the group - need to have appropriate number of representatives for each jurisdiction but ensure that group doesn’t get too large for effective meetings and decision making
- Resolving the function is needed to determine whether members should be high-level priority setters or mid-level managers tasked to do the work

#### Recommendations

- Keep Council in place but,
  - Reduce meetings to one per year to focus on jurisdictional priorities and identify commonalities
  - Make meetings more strategic and provide networking approach so Councilors can talk to each other
- If only high level managers at the table, they would need to be knowledgeable about department level
- Be creative, don’t just thinking about existing Council and Working Group vs. combining them into one entity, think instead about making the two work differently
- Consistency is key, cannot bounce topic to topic or the meetings are just workshops and not a true regional body with consistent membership
- Need balance of feds and states / provinces
  - Feds bring regional, multi-jurisdictional view

- States / provinces bring desire to learn from others and intra-state priorities
- Need to have clearly defined roles for staff and / or contractors

## **Session 2 – Evaluate Leadership Options**

---

Working Group participated in a facilitated session with break-out sessions to evaluate and provide feedback on the following four potential options for restructuring GOMC leadership.

### Option 1 – No Action, Retain Existing Leadership

- Jurisdictional government members provide leadership of Council
  - Leadership rotates – one jurisdiction per year
- Federal partners, scientific community members, NGOs, and tribal representative are active participants at the Council table
- Council membership
  - Jurisdictions (2 government representatives each, + 2 non-government )
  - Federal Agencies (1 representative each)
  - Scientific community (2 representatives – 1 US / 1 Canadian)
  - Tribal representative (1)

### Option 2 – State / Provincial and Federal Partner Joint Leadership

- Jurisdictional and federal agencies would co-lead Council
- US / Canadian shared leadership
- Rotating leadership
  - US State and Canadian Federal
  - Canadian Provincial and US Federal
- Council membership remains the same

### Option 3 – State/Provincial, Federal Partners, and NGOs Share Leadership

- Leadership shared amongst three entities
  - US / Canadian balance (rotational basis)
  - NGOs elect their own leadership
- Balance amongst NGOs (Canadian and US)
- Council membership remains the same

### Option 4 – Network Approach

- GOMC would act as a network where all agencies could be at the table
- Members could include state / provincial reps, federal agencies, non-profit organizations, academia, and others

### *Key Recommendations:*

- WG does NOT support the Network Approach
  - This option is not a leadership model but rather an approach to be applied to other leadership models.
  - Several valuable WG suggestions can be applied to other leadership models
- WG does NOT support Shared Leadership (Jurisdictional / State + Fed + NGOs)

- WG recommends that NGO role within GOMC should be assessed to maximize opportunities for working together.
- WG recommends further consideration of Shared Leadership (Jurisdictional / State + Fed)
  - Several concerns and issues would need to be addressed
- WG recommends further consideration of maintaining Existing Structure (Jurisdictional / State leadership)
  - Many opportunities for improvement can be pursued
- Regardless of leadership structure:
  - Co-chaired, shared leadership is needed to lighten the load
  - Leadership periods should be extended (and potentially overlap) to promote continuity
  - Leadership period should coincide with action plans
  - Involve NGOs and scientific advisors in committee and project work

*Summary from Breakout Session:*

**Leadership Option 1 - No Action, Retain Existing Leadership**

**Opportunities**

- Brand recognition has improved lately with CZC 2014 exposure
- Value of existing relationships that have been built up over time
- Given the longevity of GOMC – there is merit in existing form
- Led by states and provinces – allows federal needs to match state priorities instead of having federal mandates overwhelm state needs
- We need to think about how to engage NGOs. Maybe we need a separate group. Tricky to decide who NGO reps should be. Could form an advisory committee of NGO reps who would then choose 1 US / 1 Canadian rep to sit on the Council. We should have NGOs reps reflect the most significant groups focused on GOM (BoFEP, GMRI, RARGOM)
- Think of GOMC as more of an umbrella group that brings all appropriate partners in
- Need to better support each other's needs going forward, i.e. identify and follow up on the next steps beyond what happens at the meeting
- Need to examine successes and determine why they are successful, and build on those successes
- Jack Schwartz – On record in support of maintaining existing structure. Era of \$ is at an end, it's time to contract to initial structure.

**Constraints**

- Focus is currently only on coastal portion of state. State / jurisdictional reps are only having coastal staff. Need to move to a watershed approach – beyond just coastal.
- GOMC name is constraining due 'on the MARINE environment'
- We don't hold committee roles accountable. Committee co-chairs don't always participate in WG – accountability here is also lacking.
- Because structure is dysfunctional – there is a negative 'cause and effect' relationship loop between WG and Council



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

December 15, 2014 • Council Meeting • Briefing Book

---

- Imbalance between US and Canada (3 states / 2 provinces). Can result in higher US focus. Doesn't make sense for Maine to always have the Action Plan.
- Feds are considered equal partners but don't have equal representation
- Current structure is too much of a burden for the chair
- NGOs can't afford to participate – don't have travel funds etc.
- Limited federal say (if you have 4 from each state that's 20 people), then only 4 federal reps.
- Sheer size – if all seats were filled, it would be too big to get anything done.
- We have never articulated appropriate / useful role for the scientific advisors and NGOs. At least not since we had a lot of funds.
- On Canadian side, should have tribal / first nation (one Canadian / one US)
- Federal agencies are not able to provide leadership role.
- Federal priorities don't get articulated in this model.
- Does not allow federal partners and non-profits to dig deep into their resources because they don't have a leadership position
- Limiting state / provincial membership to 2 at the government level may not allow for all of the appropriate voices at the table
- NGOs may be at a disadvantage because they don't have anyone on the Working Group level – this creates a disconnect between WG and Council meetings.
- Same issue applies the scientific advisors – when at Council meetings they don't have any background because they are not engaged at WG level.
- State and provincial resources for chairing are limited

### Other Issues

- It's very rare that all of the seats possible are filled. If we filled the seats (with 10 NGOs) the dynamic would really change.
- Need to figure out what the appropriate level of membership is and how do we get there.
- Leadership terms should be extended to provide more continuity – at least 2 year. Would be good if it is tied to work plans.
- We don't take advantage enough of committees vs. working at the working group level.
- We need to think about who this group is in relation to what we are focusing on
- All of the 4 options, need to be discussed among the states and the Governor – need to know what they want! We cannot restructure this without the buy in of those involved with the charter.
- Varying opinion – some believe need to go back to Governor's and Premiers – others state that this is not possible politically.
- Once we decide what the function is, the Governors / Premiers can then appoint the right agency. Existing agency Councilors may not be the appropriate players.
- Cannot select a leadership option without knowing what we'll be doing.
- In US, there are 3 first nations – so representation could be greater.
- GOMC should coordination / collaborate with other similar binational groups to focus on key issues.

### **Leadership Option 2 - State / Provincial and Federal Partner Joint Leadership**

#### Opportunities

- Fosters more buy-in by the feds and possibly more money from the feds.

- Feds have more latitude to put in staff time. Could help alleviate pressure to have funds for contractors.
- Initial thinking behind this idea is that the feds would share the administrative burden of the chair. Better distribute the resources for the workload. Chairing the GOMC is a huge workload! Feds as co-chairs and lead with jurisdictions to share this responsibility.
- States and Provinces have even weighting as the chair. Bi-national balance. Also balances political extremities.
- Increase profile of the Council. Maybe easier to get approval to travel to attend meetings if can spin it as a co-chaired fed partnership.
- Opportunity to renew the commitment of the federal members to the Council and its mission and goals.
- Feds think regionally. Helps keeps the focus across all states and provinces. This model makes it a better steward of the environment overall.
- Increasing continuity to invite the feds into discussion.
- Feels right, like the right evolution.
- Makes it more palatable for provincial senior leadership to endorse the chairing role. Gives them a great networking opportunity for binational leadership. Could we potentially match states and fed Canada with similar interests? And vice versa? Flexible pairings and relationships.
- Better recognizes the federal role at the table so that they maintain their interest.
- Recognizes the common ground between feds/provinces/states.
- Feds could redesign fed programs with input from states. Work way up.

#### Constraints

- Following the money at the federal level doesn't always support mission of GOMC.
- Depending on the political climate, a partner could get hamstrung.
- Feds' leadership could be perceived as a conflict of interest. Federal leadership has to recuse themselves from grant opportunities.
- Perception each running their own agendas.
- Undue burden on the Canadian side (3 states, 2 provinces). Is there a way to make sure the Canadian voice is there but not the burden?

#### Other Issues

- What is the allowable relationship between federal partners and the state partners?
- Leadership and Chair have different meanings. Leadership is the vision and the mission. We're talking about the functioning of how to get the work done.
- Do the states and jurisdictions and the governors have to decide to reorganize that? It's a question of putting the feds into the leadership.
- It is unclear what Option #2 means. What will the federal agencies do? Do we need them?
- Does this change the composition of the membership?
- Does this format require binational agreements?
- Want to make sure that feds don't dilute voices of the states. Not heavily fed mandated.

- Considerations for Chairs' Rotation:
  - Change criteria of selecting the chairs—more about compatibility and flexibility.
  - Creatively think about our rotation. Explore all possibilities. Two year terms. Aligning with an operational work plan.

### **Leadership Option 3 - State/Provincial, Federal Partners, and NGOs Share Leadership**

#### **Opportunities**

- Broadens umbrella for organization
- It would define roles better (e.g. for feds, NGOs)
- Spreads responsibility for leadership between three major groups
- NGOs would support what we're doing because they're at the table.
- NGOs have network for engagement/outreach that would be available to us.
- Different organizations could take the lead for different meetings, share responsibilities.
  - This would work well with a longer term, could split up the meeting responsibilities (one partner could take the lead for certain meetings, the other partner for the others)
  - Spread the workload
- Could match up the term of the leadership with a specific work plan.
- Guided by overall vision/goals/guiding principles/high level outcomes
- If feds and provinces/states shared leadership, there'd be a balance between national/regional/state and provincial interests

#### **Constraints**

- Issues/concerns about interactions between NGOs and government entities—could we have a really frank discussion with NGOs sitting at the table? (differences of opinion on this)
  - Challenge with merging missions
  - Most of the federal agencies do not support including NGOs on the Secretariat team (DFO, EC, USGS, NOAA); some of the provinces/states don't support it either
- Do NGOs have the capacity to do this? Would we have to provide them with capacity?
  - NGOs in Canada very unlikely to be able to fill this role without resources
  - How can an NGO afford to participate even under the current model?
- Would it be more work coordinating between the leaders than it's worth?
  - Additional communication needs to occur
- Inclusion of NGOs in leadership is in violation of federal rules – US feds would have to leave the organization.
- Requires multiple mechanisms to avoid conflict and allow for division of responsible.
  - In terms of funding, if there are NGOs in a leadership role, it could be a conflict of interest
  - Could be conflict/confusion if a lead NGO is competing with GOMA for same resources.
- NGOs have to be nominated by the Governor/Premier from their jurisdiction and we have many vacant spots now.

#### **Other Issues**

- Many would like the NGOs treated differently than government and would like the current structure changed.
  - Should work things out between states/provinces and feds before engaging NGOs

- Would be more attractive to senior people if NGOs were engaged at a later stage, once priorities are decided (i.e., “here are the three things that we’re working on this year, would you like to be involved”). NGOs may be able to raise money to effectively partner; be able to draw on resources government can’t.
- Will NGOs feel slighted if they aren’t at the table at the beginning?
- Current role for NGOs is not considered appropriate for some—should not be at WG or Council (WG members do not agree on this point).
  - Perhaps they should be a separate advisory body, or perhaps largely involved at the committee level – they are topically oriented and aligned.
- Could we rotate between all organizations (e.g., not a collaboration, but rotate through).
- What is the duration of leadership? One year is very short.
- Could we be flexible on the duration of the leadership, if it’s shared? E.g., 2 year terms?
- Should there be overlapping terms? Someone is the lead one year, helps out the next year (along the lines of current model or how current model should be working... past, present, future chair)
  - Continuity with the chair having a focus area for their year
  - However, if you want to champion an issue for a year, it should be in the action plan, should be of general interest for the organization
  - Not all chairs have capacity to do this in current model
- Keep it simple and straight forward: if two jurisdictions want to co-lead, that’s good for continuity.
- Many (but not all) think that feds should be part of the leadership model.
  - However, this is not why/how the organization was formed.
  - Do we have to go back to the Governors/Premiers to do this?
- We could do a better job of leveraging NGOs in our projects/committees.
- If NGOs, why not academics? Industry?
  - We need to engage industry/academics more in our committees and projects.
  - Do not want them in a leadership role.
- NGOs are having more and more influence at the GOMA table.

#### **Leadership Option 4 - Network Approach**

##### Opportunities

- Shared accountability and more fluidity
- Free up resources tied up now to be more responsive to focus areas and emerging issues
- Distributed leadership around particular issue (2-3 yrs.)
- Could formally engage a wider group, more academia, industry
- Members may self-appoint instead of having set leadership
- Enables adaptive planning
- Emerging practices on networks and coalitions
- Promotes distance communication tools
- Implicitly network for certain topics
- Bring in the willing and the dollars, as opposed to appointed membership.
- Loosen constraints around appointments.
- Can be more inclusive, less of a club
- By bringing in more extensive network, bring in more effective, broader group -> make more progress

- Look for opportunities to share information to a broader audience
- Most people don't want to come to these types of meetings (currently) – need to mix it up.
- Right now have this in committee approach (CMSP). Network approach. GOMC provides boundaries, validity.

#### Constraints

- What would it look like?
- What makes this different from topic-specific organizations like IJC and other groups doing transboundary work in northeast
- How does it operate?
- Who's chairing and how much weight does that hold?
- Who gets work done?
- Consistency lost
- Personality driven
- Accountability lost?
- No action plan?
- Lose identity, community, visibility for GOM
- Risks duplication with groups like RARGOM (annual workshop)
- Could end up in favor of particular group or jurisdiction, loses balance.
- Over time would dissolve council and the support network is too important to have this happen.
- Diluted, no focus. Hurts relationships, continuity.
- Need some structure, not too free and easy.
- Allowing NGOs or industry to chair could polarize our work and hurt credibility.
- Need to strike balance representation on an issue.
- Networking is not an organization.
- Networking is how we do business, it's not a leadership structure.
- Let's be explicit about how we do it well.

#### Opportunities/Take-aways

- Networking should be an explicit part of Council but not its sole focus. It's a characteristic of Council, not only function.
- Take elements of network approach (host summit in prep for priority setting -> action plan). Involving academia, industry, NGOs
- Cohesive approach with RARGOM: research-> management product line
- Good, but someone needs to run the network
- Committees should be a place for network approach – and have Council for validity. Capitalize on this.
- Council provides stamp of approval that enables progress with authority to back it up.
- Networked events, committees – we're very effective at this. Way money flows.

#### GOMC

- Binational agreement, concrete effort.
- Only way US can get money to international region.
- Without leadership and formation of Council, entities like Gulfwatch would not have had mandate, solid contacts across borders, jurisdictions benefit. Networking stems from leadership associated with Council.

<b>Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment Meeting Briefing Note</b>				
<b>Title of Agenda Item:</b> GOMC Organizational Assessment –Reference Documents				
<b>Submitted by:</b> Steve Couture and Joan LeBlanc				
<b>Type of Item</b> (place X in appropriate box)	<b>For Decision</b>	<b>For Direction</b>	<b>For Information</b> (internal GOMC)	<b>For Information</b> (External)
<b>Background</b> (required):  Reference documents in support of the GOMC 2014-2015 organizational assessment are available online at the following link:  <a href="http://www.gulfofmaine.org/2/gomc-home/council-advisory-committee-2014-2015/">http://www.gulfofmaine.org/2/gomc-home/council-advisory-committee-2014-2015/</a>				
<b><u>Current List of Documents</u></b>  <u>CAC / Organizational Assessment Documents</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GOMC Organizational Assessment – Final Scope of Work</li> <li>GOMC Organizational Assessment – Final Timeline</li> <li>Summary of SWOT Analysis</li> <li>Summary of ‘Types of Work’ Exercise</li> <li>Results from facilitated sessions at October 2014 WG meeting</li> <li>CAC meeting materials</li> </ul> <u>Historical Documents</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GOMC Terms of Reference</li> <li>Working Group Terms of Reference</li> <li>Management and Finance Terms of Reference</li> <li>Secretariat Team Terms of Reference</li> <li>EPA Power Point – Sample Types of Organizational Structure</li> <li>Richert Report</li> <li>GOMC Action Plans</li> </ul>				
<b>Actions, Outcomes or Decisions Requested:</b> n/a				
<b>Supporting Documentation</b> (If applicable, list additional documents included in the Briefing Book following this Briefing Note): n/a				