



Working Group Meeting

Wednesday, December 17, 2014,

12:30 PM – 3:00 PM ET

1:30 PM – 4:00 PM AT

Briefing Book

Conference Call Access Information

Call in: 1-888-206-2266

Passcode: 5764669

Table of Contents

Meeting Agenda	3
-----------------------------	----------

Consent Agenda

- DRAFT October 2014 Working Group Meeting Summary.....	4
- DRAFT Results from Facilitated Sessions at October 2014 WG Meeting	9
- ESIP and the Delivery of Ecosystem Indicators	18
- Climate Network Activities (including King Tides)	20
- Fund Development Update.....	22

Action Agenda Briefing Notes

- Coastwise Tidal Stream Crossings	24
- Proposed Gulf of Maine Proclamation	26
- GOMA Financial Update and Audit	27

GOMC Organizational Assessment

- GOMC Organizational Assessment Reference Webpage	28
--	----

3

DRAFT Working Group Meeting Summary • Portsmouth, New Hampshire • October 15-16, 2014

Meeting Participants

GOMC Working Group Members: Bill Appleby, Environment Canada; Heather Breeze, Fisheries and Oceans Canada; Rob Capozzi, NB Department of Environment and Local Government (via conference call); Steve Couture, NH Department of Environmental Services; Sophia Foley, NS Department of Environment (via conference call); Steve Couture, NH Department of Environmental Services; Tim Hall, Fisheries and Oceans Canada; Ellen Mecray, NOAA; Rebecca Newhall, NOAA; Betsy Nicholson, NOAA; Kathryn Parlee, Environment Canada; Ann Rodney, US Environmental Protection Agency; Susan Russell-Robinson, USGS; Jack Schwartz, MA Division of Marine Fisheries; Theresa Torrent, Maine Coastal Program; Prasade Vella, MA Office of Coastal Zone Management; and Bill Whitman, NS Fisheries and Aquaculture.

GOMC Council Members: Jen Anderson, NOAA; Terry Holman, Department of Interior; and Ru Morrison, NERACOOS.

Other participants and guest speakers: Cathy Colletti, NH Department of Environmental Services; Jen Graham, NS Environment; Adrienne Harrison, NOAA; Glen Hebert, Fisheries and Oceans Canada; Jeff Kennedy, MA Division of Marine Fisheries; Cindy Krum, GOMA Executive Director (via conference call); Joan LeBlanc, GOMC Council Coordinator; Nancy Shackell, Bedford Institute of Oceanography (via conference call); Cliff Sinnott, Rockingham Planning Commission; Peter Slovinsky, Maine Geological Survey; and David Vallee, National Weather Service.

Opening Remarks

Working Group Chair Steve Couture of New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services welcomed participants and outlined objectives for the meeting.

Consent Agenda

The following consent agenda item was accepted:

- Summary of Key Decisions and Action Items – August 2014 Working Group Meeting

Geocaching Project Update

Kathryn Parlee provided an update regarding the Gulf of Maine Council's Geocaching Project. The project was launched in July. Participants search for geocache sites around the Gulf of Maine using a Passport as the guide. Since the project began, the passport has been downloaded 140 times, participants have earned 13 geocoins, and the website had over 1,000 hits during July alone.

Next Steps

- Work with Canadian geocaching association to increase awareness on the Canadian side
- Continue promoting the GeoTour throughout the Gulf of Maine. WG members suggested the following strategies for promoting the project going forward:
 - Promote at regional GOM events such as NEOSEC in November
 - Forward to marine educator associations and other educator lists
 - Encourage participants to share stories and photos from the GeoTour

GOMC / GOMA Fund Development Update

Cindy provided an update regarding fund development activities. Sufficient funding is available to continue with core operations for the coming year. Fund development contractor Jim Boyle finished up work for GOMC at the end of September.

- Mitigation Funding. Jim Boyle submitted Letters of Intent to several foundations in support of the concept of mitigation funding. Jim recommended submitting a general informational letter along with copies of

the 25th anniversary publication to environmental attorneys working in Attorney General Offices, and other enforcement officials at environmental agencies.

- Special Body of Water Designation. The ad-hoc committee met for the third time in August 2014. The committee decided not to recommend a major coalition building effort at this time, but did recommend hosting a Gulf of Maine Day event in 2015 to raise awareness and visibility about the GOMC.
- Proposals. The following two proposals will be submitted to the Environment Canada Gulf of Maine Initiative: 1) ESIP - Monitoring to understand human impacts on the health of the Gulf of Maine system, and 2) Gulfwatch - Monitoring selected chemicals of emerging concern in mussels in the Bay of Fundy. The Climate Network plans to submit proposals to the Environment Canada Atlantic Ecosystem Initiative and the NOAA Climate Program Office.
- Coastwise Stream Crossings Project. Slade Moore is developing a project idea for coastwise stream crossings. During the month of October he will be in touch with jurisdictions to determine needs.

Key Decisions / Action Items

Fund Development

- Working Group did not support recommendation to send GOMC mailing of 25th Anniversary publication to enforcement agencies to promote GOMC consideration for mitigation funding.
- Brainstorming session for projects that address jurisdictional needs was tabled and will take place during a separate call.
- Cindy reminded WG members to respond to Slade's survey regarding Coastwise Road Crossings by end of the week.

Gulf of Maine Day

- Working Group supported the recommendation to hold a Gulf of Maine Day event / ceremony in June 2015
- Working Group supported proposal to secure a proclamation in support of Gulf of Maine Day
- Working Group members will work to secure support from partners
- Susan will preparing briefing materials for Council consideration on December call
- 25th Anniversary Committee will support effort
- Cathy Colletti will assist with outreach and communications
- Working Group recommended collaborating with other regionally based non-profit organizations

King Tides Project

Ellen Mecray provided an update regarding the Climate Network's King Tides Project, which was kicked off in October 2014. The project included a photo contest and local events in Maine and New Hampshire to highlight potential impacts of future sea level rise conditions on coastal resources. As part of the GOM King Tides Project, University of Southern Maine students, with help from a state coastal geologist and their art professor, are mapping out a 3-foot rise in locations around Portland. They will make an educational art installation at several settings later this fall.

The success of the project highlights the value of GOMC to work at a multijurisdictional level. Working Group members noted that the project has been very successful at raising awareness about sea level rise and the Gulf of Maine. The Climate Network received funding from the Maine Community Foundation and worked in partnership with a wide range of organizations to ensure the success of this project. Information about the project can be found at gulfofmaine.kingtides.net

Next Steps

- Announce award winners
- Make photos available for educational purposes and to support community planning
- Incorporate photos into mapping efforts (MDI Biological Lab)

- Maintain regional website
- Host annual events

Climate Workshop

Working Group members heard from the following experts on topics related to climate change.

- NOAA's Digital Coast: *Adrienne Harrison, NOAA*, provided an overview of NOAA's Digital Coast website featuring a suite of data, tools, and training opportunities for local communities to help plan for coastal hazards.
- Shellfish Management Implications Associated with Climate Change: *Jeff Kennedy, MA Division of Marine Fisheries*, discussed shellfish management implications from ocean acidification, increasing temperature, and ecosystem alterations.
- Research on Habitat Changes for Commercial Fisheries due to Climate Change: *Nancy Shackell, Bedford Institute of Oceanography*, provided an overview of research aimed at examining whether local warming will have an impact on habitat for marine species in the Northwest Atlantic. Habitat changes were estimated using a realized thermal habitat index under short-term (2030) and long-term (2060) warming scenarios.
- Flooding and Rainfall Data for New England: *David Vallee, Hydrologist, National Weather Service*, provided a look at flooding and rainfall for New England and discuss how weather patterns are changing and what this means for the land side.
- New Hampshire Coastal Risks and Hazards Commission: *Cliff Sinnott, Rockingham Planning Commission*, provided an update from the New Hampshire Coastal Risks and Hazards Commission established in 2013 to help coastal communities and the state of New Hampshire prepare for projected sea level rise and other coastal watershed hazards.
- State of Maine – Sea Level Adaptation Working Group: *Peter Slovinsky, Coastal Geologist, Maine Geological Survey*, provided an overview of tools and strategies being utilized by the Sea Level Adaptation Working Group to promote coastal resiliency in Southern Maine.

Presentations from the climate workshops are available at: <http://www.gulfofmaine.org/2/?p=5002>

GOMC Organizational Assessment - Update from Council Advisory Committee

Joan LeBlanc and Steve Couture provided an update from the Council Advisory Committee meeting and summarized next steps for the CAC and Working Group.

- 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 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

Some WG members raised concerns about the need to focus on ‘form follows function’ instead of the proposed approach of considering GOMC structural and leadership options.

Facilitated Session - Evaluating Option of Combining WG 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

** All of the advantages and constraints associated with combining Working Group and Council that were identified during the facilitated session are summarized in a separate document.*

Facilitated Session - Evaluating GOMC Leadership Options

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

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

** All of the opportunities and constraints identified during the Working Group session for each leadership option are summarized in a separate document.*

Next Steps for GOMC Organization Assessment

- Joan will summarize results from Working Group session
- Working Group recommendations will be provided to CAC
- CAC will meet in November to discuss feedback from Working Group
- CAC will identify preliminary recommendations for December Council meeting

Meeting adjourned at approximately 5:30 p.m.

Meeting summary prepared by Joan LeBlanc, Council Coordinator.

The Briefing Book for the meeting is available at: <http://www.gulfofmaine.org/2/gomc-home/council-meetings/>

Copies of climate workshop and other presentations from the meeting are available at:
<http://www.gulfofmaine.org/2/?p=5002>

Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment / Organizational Assessment DRAFT 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
- 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 coordinate / 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.

Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment Meeting Briefing Note					
Title of Agenda Item: ESIP and the Delivery of Ecosystem Indicators					
Submitted by: Kathryn Parlee (Environment Canada) and Jim Latimer (Environmental Protection Agency) ESIP Co-Chairs					
Type of Item (place X in appropriate box)	For Decision	For Direction	For Information (internal GOMC)	X	For Information (External)
<p>Background (required):</p> <p><u>Introductory Video</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.</p> <p>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 (www.gulfofmaine.org/esip) or directly on YouTube at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OXyhCLktqsc#t=33.</p> <div data-bbox="787 735 1386 1077" data-label="Image"> <p>The image is a screenshot of a YouTube video player. The video title is 'EcoSystem Indicator Partnership: Information on Change in the Gulf of M...'. The video shows a coastal scene with a white lighthouse on the right, a small white house with a red roof in the middle ground, and a rocky coastline with a path leading down to the water. The video player interface includes a progress bar at 0:33 / 3:24, a volume icon, and a full screen button.</p> </div> <p><u>ICUC App</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>ESIP Phase 2 - Directional Committee</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>					

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):

Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment Meeting Briefing Note					
Title of Agenda Item: Climate Network Activities (including King Tides)					
Submitted by: Ellen Mecray and Bill Appleby, Climate Network Co-Chairs					
Type of Item (place X in appropriate box)	For Decision	For Direction	For Information (internal GOMC)	X	For Information (External)
<p>Background (required):</p> <p>The GOMC Climate Network has launched a quarterly e-bulletin that incorporates the Gulf of Maine Region Climate Impacts and Outlook (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 Climate Network e-bulletin 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 climate information dashboard that provides multiple links to recent and real-time data sources (e.g., 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 Gulf of Maine King Tides Photo Contest, 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 http://gulfofmaine.kingtides.net/2014/08/28/featured-event-october-9-2014/), 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"> • ‘King Tide’ seen as test for rising seas, <i>Gloucester Times (MA)</i>, 10/3/2014 • King tide provides a glimpse into the future, <i>WCSH TV (ME)</i>, 10/9/14 • Photo contest focuses on high tide, <i>Chronicle Herald News (NS)</i>, 10/7/14 <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"> • Student art exhibit along two Portland trails envisions the effects of rising sea level, <i>Portland Press Herald</i>, 11/25/14 • USM students hope Portland trail creates a wave of awareness about sea-level rise, <i>The Forecaster</i>, 12/1/2014 					

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

Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment Meeting Briefing Note					
Title of Agenda Item: GOMC / GOMA Fund Development Update					
Submitted by: Cynthia Krum					
Type of Item (place X in appropriate box)	For Decision	For Direction	For Information (internal GOMC)	X	For Information (External)
Background (required):					
<p><u>Federal Funding Proposals</u></p> <p>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.</p>					
<p>Environment Canada Gulf of Maine Initiative Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecosystem Indicator Partnership (ESIP): <i>Monitoring to understand human impacts on the health of the Gulf Maine system</i> <p>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 responsibly analyze the cost/benefits of coastal development in relation to habitat conservation and sustainable ecosystem health in the Bay of Fundy and the Gulf of Maine.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gulfwatch: <i>Monitoring selected chemicals of emerging concern in mussels in the Bay of Fundy</i> <p>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.</p>					
<p>Environment Canada Atlantic Ecosystem Initiative proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate Network: <i>Increasing climate risk preparedness, water quality management and flooding control by enhancing planning use of intensity/duration/frequency rainfall data</i> <p>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.</p>					
<p>National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Climate Program Office proposal:</p>					

- **Climate Network: *Building resilience in vulnerable coastal populations of the Northeast***

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 25th 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 Council meeting section of the GOMC website at:

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

Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment Meeting Briefing Note					
Title of Agenda Item: CoastWise Tidal Road Crossings					
Submitted by: Cynthia Krum					
Type of Item (place X in appropriate box)	For Decision	For Direction	x	For Information (internal GOMC)	x
For Information (External)					
Background (required):					
<p>Federal Funding Proposals</p> <p>After Management and Finance Committee approval, Slade Moore was contracted to prepare an assessment of the need for outreach and guidance documents regarding tidal road crossings. The <i>CoastWise Tidal Road Crossing Concept Assessment</i> report was completed in November, 2014.</p> <p>Below is the “Conclusions and Next Steps” section of the report. The full report is also uploaded on the GOMC website in the Meetings section.</p> <p>Conclusions and Next Steps</p> <p>Responses to the questionnaire described above provided the basis for a rapid assessment of jurisdictional need and interest in a CoastWise tidal road crossing initiative. One important caveat should be mentioned, namely that most of the respondents were solicited based primarily on their interest in GOMC-sponsored efforts to support coastal conservation and restoration. Comprehensive knowledge of regulatory requirements related to tidal stream crossings was not a prerequisite. As a result, the ability of responses to accurately provide specific regulatory answers to questions #1 and #2 seemed uncertain. However, those same responses seemed to suggest that none of the jurisdictions have regulations specifically geared toward applying the full suite of critical design elements (crossing size, elevation, slope, alignment, fish passage, sea level rise, etc.) that influence the ecological integrity and resiliency of tidal road crossings.</p> <p>Conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ None of the GOM jurisdictions appeared to have comprehensive regulations specifically tuned to the construction or replacement of road crossings in tidal environments by all ownership types.▪ Public awareness of sea level rise consequences and the benefits of road crossings that provide improved tidal exchange is, on the whole, moderate except in locales and regions where the public’s experience with coastal flooding, tidal restoration projects or coastal outreach programs is common.▪ All jurisdictions could benefit from a CoastWise initiative that provides guidelines and principles for improved tidal road crossing design and the outreach to encourage application of those principles.▪ Each jurisdiction showed an interest in one or more near-term outreach products, ranging from an informational brochure to training.▪ Outreach could focus on a set of principles or rules of thumb for a given set of conditions at tidal sites.▪ Outreach principles could be based on an assessment of data from tidal road projects completed and/or new engineering/modeling.▪ Funding is critical for further developing a CoastWise concept, but specific avenues for funding were not provided by the respondents.▪ The respondents were interested in participating in further discussions about a CoastWise initiative and provided a list of other potential participants.					

Next Steps:

- Validating the assertion that comprehensive regulations specific to tidal crossings are lacking might provide the most immediate “next step”. A single representative from each jurisdiction working with her/his relevant federal and state/provincial regulators could accomplish this with relatively minor effort.
- Most respondents seemed to prefer a stand-alone GOMC-coordinated work session as a vehicle for scoping the CoastWise concept. A key element of that work session could be to determine whether and how a CoastWise tidal road crossing initiative would integrate with planning for coastal hazards resiliency, sea level rise, marsh migration, and blue carbon sequestration.
- Likewise, during that work session or before, a core group of interested project partners could identify who has access to restoration project data that could support development of empirically based guidelines and principles for tidal road stream crossings.

Actions, Outcomes or Decisions Requested (optional):

Make a recommendation for next steps.

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

CoastWise Report Final document is available in the meeting section of the GOMC website.

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

Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment Meeting Briefing Note					
Title of Agenda Item: Celebrating the Gulf of Maine – proposed proclamation in June 2015					
Submitted by: Susan Russell-Robinson and the 25 th Anniversary Committee					
Type of Item (place X in appropriate box)	For Decision	For Direction	x	For Information (internal GOMC)	For Information (External)
Background (required): 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. 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?					
Possible Activities / Next Steps (optional): <div style="margin-left: 40px;"> (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 25th anniversary of GOMC and to tie to World Oceans Day (June 8, 2015). (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. (3) GOM Councilors: Discussion of what announcement or action would occur at June 17, 2015 meeting as a culminating event for GOMC 25th anniversary. </div>					
Actions, Outcomes or Decisions Requested (optional): If Council approves development of Proclamation and Resolution of Support, Working Group is asked to discuss plans associated with developing the proclamation and organizing a culminating 25 th anniversary event to be held in conjunction with the June 2015 GOMC meetings in New Hampshire.					
Supporting Documentation (If applicable, list additional documents included in the Briefing Book following this Briefing Note): See GOMC Action Plan 2001-2006, pages 6 & 7 http://www.gulfofmaine.org/council/action_plan/action_plan2001-06.pdf					

Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment Meeting Briefing Note					
Title of Agenda Item: GOMA Financial Update and Audit					
Submitted by: Cynthia Krum					
Type of Item (place X in appropriate box)	For Decision	For Direction	For Information (internal GOMC)	X	For Information (External)
Background (required): <div style="margin-left: 20px;">1. Financial Update 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. <u>Budget vs. Actual Report</u> This document shows expenses compared to budget in the current fiscal year. <u>July 2014 - June 2015 Revised Operating Budget and July 2015 - June 2016 Budget Prediction</u> 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. <u>Six-Month Contractor Scopes of Work</u> 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.</div> <div style="margin-left: 20px;">2. GOMA Audit 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.</div>					
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): GOMA Financial Report and Operating Budget and Six-Month Contractor Scopes of Work are available with the Council meeting additional reference documents on the GOMC website at: http://www.gulfofmaine.org/2/gomc-home/council-meetings/					

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