

Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment

Working Group Briefing Packet Version 1 Portsmouth, New Hampshire • March 24-25, 2010



Table of Contents

Working Group Agenda	2
Consent Agenda	4
Council Action Plan and New Directions/Participant Priorities	27
Part Two: Charting our Course. Marine Spatial Planning Overview with Provincial, State, and Federal Program	
Linkages	29
Update on the State of the Gulf of Maine and its Role in the Next Five Year Plan	31
Acting on Council's Request: The Gulf of Maine Conservation and Restoration Initiative	32



Working Group Agenda

Wednesday, March 24, 2010 (Portsmouth Public Library, 175 Parrott Ave., Portsmouth NH)

9:30 AM	Welcome, introductions, and overview and objectives for the meeting Ted Diers, Coastal Program, NH Department of Environmental Services and Working Group Chair
9:35 AM (PAGE 4)	 Accept consent agenda Committee and Subcommittee reports Climate Change Committee Gulfwatch Contaminants Monitoring Subcommittee Habitat Monitoring Subcommittee Habitat Restoration Subcommittee Sustainable Industries and Communities Committee NOAA Marine Managed Areas Best Management Practices for Boundary Making GOMC-NROC Memorandum of Agreement FY 11 budget predictions and dues status report Services Donated to the GOMC Gulf of Maine Times Contributors
9:36 am	 GOMC June Meeting and World Oceans Day final planning and Wall of Achievements Ted Diers and Theresa Torrent-Ellis, ME Coastal Program and US Chair, GOMC Outreach Committee Background: There has been significant work on planning of the June meeting and the celebration of WOD and the anniversary of the Council. A few changes have been made to the original plans. At this time, the final decisions need to be made in regards to guests, awards, and other fun components of the celebration evening. Outcome/Desired Action: The final agenda will be accepted and the committee will be ready to extend invitations to the Gala celebration of the Council.
10:00 AM	 Part One: Charting our Course What's in it for you? Ted Diers with support from Michele Tremblay, Council Coordinator and David Keeley, Development Coordinator Background: As work commences on drafting a new five-year plan, it is timely to explore how the activities of the Gulf of Maine Council advance/complement the work of the member agencies and organizations. This session will first explore the current activities of the council and how agencies see benefits (or not) to their organization/jurisdiction. WG members then make a short presentation on what is "hot" in their work related to coastal and ocean issues. WG members should be prepared to make five-eight minute presentations on current/emerging coastal priorities. Outcome/Desired Action: This session will produce two items: jurisdictional assessment of support for current priority Council activities (e.g., indicators/State of the Gulf of Maine reporting, habitat restoration, climate change, and communications/<i>Gulf of Maine Times</i>) and identification of current/emerging jurisdictional priorities that could be addressed in the new five-year Plan.
11:00 AM (PAGE 27)	Council Action Plan and new directions / participant priorities Ted Diers with support from Michele Tremblay, Council Coordinator and David Keeley, Development Coordinator Background: Based on the discussion on the previous items. The Working Group will look at the "hot" issues in our organizations and jurisdictions as they related back to the broader Action Plan and its three goal areas. The Working Group will then discuss some of these issues to add to the agenda for the next day's agenda. This session will end with a brief discussion about how to build a process for the Action plan to be written and any new issues to be vetted with constituents. Outcome/Desired Action: The Working Group will decide on a road map and scope for its new five- year Action Plan with an emphasis on jurisdictional priorities.
12:00 РМ	Lunch on your own in downtown Portsmouth Suggestions for restaurants within walking distance will be provided
1:30 рм	Council Action Plan and new directions / participant priorities (continued)



2:30 рм	Part Two: Charting our Course
(page 29)	Marine Spatial Planning Overview with provincial, state, and federal program linkages Adrianne Harrison, NOAA, Discussion leader with Tim Hall, Department of Fisheries and Oceans; Susan Russell-Robinson, US Department of the Interior
	 Background: In October 2009, US Federal Agencies briefed the working group on two national initiatives - the National Ocean Policy and Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) Framework. Marine Spatial Planning is of special interest to the Northeast Regional Ocean Council (NROC) because of individual state activities related to development of ocean use plans. The purpose of this session is to inform the Working Group of current and anticipated provincial, state, and federal marine spatial planning activities. This session also serves to inform Working Group on provincial, state, and federal priorities related to marine spatial planning heading into the Action Plan update, including expected allocations of funding, staff time, and other resources. Provincial and state participants are asked to provide their presentations during this session. Outcome/Desired Action: To gain better understanding of MSP activities in the Gulf of Maine, Discuss potential roles for GOMC in facilitating MSP (i.e. Canadian ex-officio member, Canadian lessons learned, serving as fiscal agent), and identify opportunities to work with other regional groups such to advance MSP action in the Gulf of Maine.
3:00 pm (page 31)	 Update on the State of the Gulf of Maine and its role in the next five year plan <i>Tim Hall, Department of Fisheries and Oceans; Ted Diers;</i> and <i>Theresa Torrent-Ellis</i> Background: Great progress has been made in the first stages of production of the State of the Gulf of Maine Report. They are on task and the progress all indicates that there will be a release of the background document, and the first three theme papers by the June Council meeting. These will be in both a PDF and as a website. Outcome/Desired Action: Each jurisdiction will bring to the table a key person to do press release support and promotion of the State of the Gulf of Maine. Next steps will be adopted including recommendations on the goals of the State of the Gulf of Maine for the next five-year Action Plan.
4:00 рм	Time for items removed from Consent Agenda or unfinished business
4:30 рм	Recess for the day
5:30 рм	Meet in Hilton Garden Inn lobby for group supper

Thursday, March 25, 2010 (Portsmouth Public Library, 175 Parrott Ave., Portsmouth NH)

9:30 ам	 Part Three: Charting our Course Gulf of Maine: the next five year plan Ted Diers, Theresa Torrent-Ellis, and David Keeley Background: In preparation for the development of the 2012-2017 five-year Action Plan the Secretariat and Maine are beginning an assessment of need, both for the scope of the revisions to the current Action Plan goals and of the audience to be served by the plan. This session will also be informed by a summary of the sessions from the previous day. Outcome/Desired Action: As a group, we will explore recommendations provided by Maine with feedback from the Secretarial team on scope and objectives of the next five-year Plan. We will also explore how this is informed by the collaborative planning initiative that extends from the Bay of Fundy to Long Island Sound. We will explore the key audiences that the Plan serves. We will decide on the process that we would recommend for the development of the next Plan.
12:30 РМ	Meeting adjourns



Consent Agenda December 2009 Working Group Meeting Summary

Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment Working Group

Meeting DRAFT Summary Portsmouth, NH December 8-9, 2009

Working Group members present

Rob Capozi, NB Department of Environment; Ted Diers, NH Department of Environmental Services; Jennifer Hackett, Department of Fisheries and Oceans; Tim Hall, Department of Fisheries and Oceans; Russ Henry, NB Department of Agriculture and Aquaculture; Julia Knisel, MA Office of Coastal Zone Management; Larry Hildebrand, Environment Canada; Betsy Nicholson, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; Ann Rodney, US Environmental Protection Agency; Jack Schwartz, MA Division of Fisheries; Theresa Torrent-Ellis, ME State Planning Office; and Peter Wells, Dalhousie University.

Others present

Cathy Coletti, NH Coastal Program; Adrianne Harrison, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; David Keeley, Development Coordinator; Cindy Krum, US Gulf of Maine Association; Peter Lamb, New Hampshire Charitable Foundation; Jackie Olsen, Environment Canada; Mary Power, NH Coastal Program; John Terry, Gulf of Maine Institute; Michele L. Tremblay, Council Coordinator; Marianna Vulli, Conservation Law Foundation; Jay Walmsley, Department of Fisheries and Oceans; and Matt Wood, GOMC Administrative Assistant from NH Department of Environmental Services.

Consent Agenda

Decision: The Working Group accepted the consent agenda.

The Gulf of Maine Institute: Community Based Stewardship

Theresa gave a brief introduction to John Terry of the Gulf of Maine Institute, who presented a background of the organization. The Gulf of Maine Institute has been established for nearly a decades. It was established in 2000 with a grant from Canada. The mission of the institute is to work with communities within the Gulf of Maine on community based environmental issues. The institute has a specific focus on high school youths. The institute prides itself on being able to bring students together on a multinational level. Once a year the Gulf of Maine Institute brings students from the United States and Canada together to discuss similarities and differences between its community based stewardship local projects. The institute has grown substantially over the last ten years, from 40 participants operating out of a motel room to over 100 participants. The institute has also developed a partnership with Tuffs University to help educate teachers on Community Based Stewardship, which is part of a national movement to get people outside in their own communities. Examples of projects the institute has work on over the last ten years include Perennial Pepperweed Monitoring, Climate Change Monitoring, and Community Development. The institute's goal in talking with the Working Group today is to develop a closer relationship with the Gulf of Maine Council and to determine how best to accomplish the goals of developing a stronger teacher education program, developing a community based stewardship toolbox for educators throughout the gulf, and developing a regional conference to bring educators and scientists together. Ted commented that the Gulf of Maine Times might be useful mechanism for achieving some of these goals together. Larry asked if participants in the program were tracked over time to determine if the institute impacted career goals. Because of resource limitations formal tracking of participants is currently not feasible. Cathy inquired as to the recruitment process, which is currently conducted through word of mouth. Most participants come to the institute and present an idea, however there is some limited solicitation.

Gulf of Maine Community Toolbox

Theresa gave an overview of the new outreach tool that is currently being developed by the Maine Coastal Program. The Coastal program would like to release the kit in June 2010 and have an overarching message that aligns with that of the council's action plan. The Working Group concluded that before the Council can stand behind this project the messages emphasized by each of the participating organizations must be thoroughly examined. It would be embarrassing to the council if they partnered with organizations that were portraying viewpoints that were contradictory to that of the council.

Action: Once the toolbox has been completed, Theresa with submit a copy to the Working Group so that it may be examined and determined if it aligns with the council's overall goals and message.



Celebrating 20 Years of the Council: Ocean Day 2010

Theresa led a discussion on the upcoming 20 year celebration and how it could be tied in to World Ocean Day. A summary of the ideas generated through that discussion are presented in the table below:

Planning element	Options	Decision / recommended actions
Event venue		Eastland Park Hotel, Portland, ME
Schedule/structure of celebration		 June 7 Day long: Working Group meeting Release State of the Gulf of Maine report 6:30: Census of Marine Life presentation by Gulf of Maine Research Institute June 8: World Ocean Day 8:00 -11:30: Working Group meeting 12:00 - 6:00: World Ocean Day exhibits/presentations high school poster session (Gulf of Maine Institute) and local art display (art night out) possible film or film festival 6:30 -10:30: World Ocean Day dinner/council recognition with "friends of the gulf" entertainment Council anniversary and other awards and recognition June 9: Council meeting
Theme(s) (one for WOD) and one for the Gulf of Maine	 Use World Ocean Day theme and have subtheme for the Council "Our vision for the next 20 years" "20/20 Vision for the Gulf" "The Gulf of Maine And The World's Ocean" "GOM: Our World's Ocean" "GOM: Your Ocean" 	
Collateral	 Posters (post them on ferries) Outreach video (can be shown on ferries) Gulf specific logo (in addition to WOD logo) 	
Corporate sponsorship	Maine-centricGulf-wide	
Banquet	 Paid open registration or invitation only (fee or no fee) Corporate sponsorship Canadian consulate sponsorship Send out specific invitations for those we want to come. Reserve a number of seats and if they are not filled, open them to the public. 	



Wall of accomplishments	 Prepared ahead of time Poll partners for accomplishments Interactive Opportunity to add achievement on site (possible intern from jurisdictions) 	
Film/film festival	 Natural Resources Defense Council ocean acidification video* Wild and scenic festival (Patagonia grant) 	
State of the Gulf of Maine Report release		
Gulf of Maine Times Support	Cooperate SponsorshipSummer issue sponsorship	
Participation	 Paid registration Web conferencing governors and Premiers Possible web conference with Halifax World Ocean Day Bay of Fundy Ecosystem Partnership 	
Media coverage/involvement	 CA and US media release CA and US media packet Poster for ferries Show our partners films on ferries 	

Other thoughts/"parking lot" issues

Additional messaging such as "Welcome to the Southern Bay of Fundy" *Wild and Scenic Environmental Film Festival (grant available) Current budget: \$5,000 in a pending request

Action: Theresa will use the Council's internal listserves to solicit volunteers for the committees to assist with the various aspects of the planning.

Action: Present the above material to the Council at Thursdays (12/10/09) meeting with a recommendation that to proceed with the planning of the event.

Action: "Save the Date" messages will be distributed by the GOMC Outreach Committee through Constant Contact and through the Council's internal listserves by Michele Tremblay.

State of the Gulf of Maine Report

Jay gave an update to the Working Group on progress made on the State of the Gulf of Maine report. The intent is to release the report in June, possibly in conjunction with the 20 Year Celebration. The products that will be release in June will include a website that contains the context document and three to four of the theme papers. As they are completed, the remainder of the 14 theme papers will be added to the website, with the goal of completion in three years. The topics of the 14 theme papers include: Climate Change and its Effect on Humans; Climate Change and its Effect on Ecosystems, Habitat and Biota; Aquaculture in the Gulf of Maine; Commercial Fisheries and Fish Stock Status; Land Use and Coastal Development; Toxic Contaminants; Microbial Pathogens and Toxins; Eutrophication; Coastal Ecosystems and Habitats; Offshore Ecosystems and Habitats; Watershed Status; Invasive Species; Species at Risk; and Emerging Issues. Theresa asked if the Gulf of Maine Times editorial board might be used to look at these papers to make sure everything is accurate and presented in such a way that aligns with the Council's message. Jay informed the Working Group that drafts of the first three to four papers will be due in March. The review process will take place in April through May, so that the papers can be posted to the website in June. The Working Group clarified that review that comes from the Council should be merely for content and not editorial in nature. Editorial comments will be done through the peer review process.

Action: Present this material to the Council at Thursdays (12/10/09) meeting with a request for volunteers to be on a committee that will review the document concurrently with the Working Group.



Action: Jay will develop a job description of what is involved for a reviewer and an estimation of the time involved. Jay will then distribute this material through the Council's internal listserves to the Working Group. Action: Committee Chairs will then distribute the material submitted by Jay to their respective committees and subcommittees to solicit volunteers to review the papers.

A "Working Session" For Securing Resources for Council Priorities

David gave the Working Group a brief background on the intent of the working session. David informed the group that the Council has identified what projects it wants to support through the Gulf of Maine Council and what projects it wants to support through other organizations, which are in support of the Action Plan. The working session will help to develop plans for moving committees' ideas to the next level. Prior to breaking out into the working groups Peter Lamb of the NH Charitable Foundation and Marianna Vulli of the Conservation Law Foundation shared their perspectives on the changing climate for foundation giving. Peter suggested that prior to contacting any organization the Council should develop a comprehensive understanding of the organizations/foundations values, the history of their giving, and their asset strategy (spend down, etc.). It is also extremely valuable to research the organization prior to contacting them. After using their respective websites to get all the information possible, the first time the foundation is contacted should not be used as an information gathering session. Explain what the Council's needs are and ask how the foundation might help support this. It should be used to develop a relationship with the employees. The presenters agreed that in recent years foundations have been more prone to fund organizations/projects that have a single focus, not a broad area of interest. It is important to understand what is informing decision-making by the foundation, what motivates them and their culture. In addition foundations are moving more toward operating grants than in the past. They are interested in the financial health of applicant organizations and there are more frequent reviews of budgets. Scalability and replicability of the results to other situations is important to demonstrate. When seeking a grant from an organization it is important to weigh the time it takes to the amount to be received. The council must also consider the networks that will be generated from working with a foundation. Many foundations give to the same organizations time and again. The time spent to get the Council's foot in the door with a small grant award may pay off in the long run with a substantial operational grant. Some of the resources suggested for the council to look into were: the Walton Family Foundation; the Pew Charitable Trusts; the Gordon Betty Moore Foundation; the David and Lucile Packard Foundation; www.opengrants.gov; the Horizon Foundation; and to review the funders lists in other organization reports.

Work session on ESIP summary:

Participants: Betsy Nicholson, Peter Wells, David Keeley, Ann Rodney, Jay Whamsley, Tim Hall

Summary:

Recommendation to consider Project #2, and to get our work done through this project on evaluation and robust indicators. Need to demonstrate results and use this opportunity to test drive tool with managers. Have ESIP pick specific audience. More attractive to funders and agencies if we can show applicability and replication.

Group reaction to ESIP audience:

Feeling that ESIP's description of its target audience is too broad. Yes, we went out to this audience earlier and asked how they received info and how they would use it, but we agreed that one of project ideas is to make sure that we're hitting the audience through small scale workshops, etc. Who is it within these audience categories that we should be targeting? Let's get more specific.

Project idea #1:

Go back to people who provided advice at 2006 listening session workshops. Are ESIP products and services meeting your needs?

Rather than market to bigger audience, **market that this is a dependable and anticipated source of sound science.** It markets itself. Also can market consistency of indicators for one ecosystem. No one entity has been able to do this.

Initial splash of report starts a dialogue - can be viewed as fire starter.

Report must demonstrate how indicators can help solve the issues managers are dealing with. Use real issue and explain how ESIP can help make decisions more informed, more credible.

Branding of the product needs to change to be sold better. The way it's framed now assumes that target audiences need to come to us. Change to be a tool for decision making and demonstrate benefits to managers. E.g.,



Bring ESIP to Canadian management body in maritimes and get them to ask how ESIP can help them. Using terms like "data" and data management" doesn't sell.

Too many SOE projects start with too big a document (expensive) and then the pendulum swings back to a brief indicator report card....need to hit in between. Need a report card with context. ESIP work will be valuable to provide the context. Needs to be more 3D than a data tool.

Articulate that it's more than a tool. It's the application and it can be replicated.

ESIP wants to be seen as a data source, not as an interpreter. The Council however wants ESIP to provide synthesis of what the data is telling us about the health of the GOM ecosystem.

Missing piece is to **bring the tool to management tables**. First project speaks to this, but limited by just targeting the listening session participants. Could include one on one meetings with managers. Needs to be a broader evaluation.

Project 2:

Going to conglomerates for feedback.

Model: Stormwater Center started as a neutral, data provider and is now being pursued by developers that want to green their projects. Turning their position on its head.

ESIP indicators will be used in theme papers for SOE reporting. Good opportunity for review from both sides of the border. Need to ask if the authors found the ESIP data useful? Clear? Credible?

Concept of ESIP is not confined to the GOM. Should be able to put into a context that is developed collaboratively. Rolland Cormier, CA Gulf region, includes Quebec, PEI. Done some UN work.

Theme: Be sure that ESIP thinks about evaluation. Must be an evaluation component to learn firsthand how useful people found ESIP products and services.

How many people need to be making decisions at a regional scale? If decisions need to be made more locally than data is not dense enough. Goes directly to the discussion of audience.

What is ESIP's delivery mechanism? Consulting role beyond feedback. Project 2 would be first step...what's the staying power? How do you get the repeated use from managers? This may not be ESIP's role, but an invitation for partnership opportunities.

Leverage ESIP with other tools and collaborations: Partner with Sea Grant extension agents, NH Natural Resources Outreach Coalition (NROC).

Evaluation is key – NH NROC is good model for evaluation. NHCP did formal evaluation several years ago.

'Other projects' #2:

What indicators do we have data for and which are light on data? Why would we start on ESIP 2 when we don't have data for ESIP 1? ESIP needs to give the Council a good idea of where we are with each topic. Can combine 'other projects' 1 and 2.

Conundrum of whether ESIP will report on data or interpret it. SOE reporting serves to raise the red flag.

<u>Other project #3</u>: Support and demo ESIP applications – where could this be tested?

CA Community Values Criteria

NB – ESIP could be used to monitor decision making process. We would have to go to them to get them more familiar.

ESIP could be applied as place-based area or applied to a decision making process.

MOP – going through process of establishing indicators of environmental, economic and social change, and then filter those indicators for which changes are attributable to MA ocean plan.

Need to know from Christine which indicators are ready to go/robust.



Other Projects": #4 -

Implement communications plan: take one part of ESIP and use for outreach purposes. Focus on that and see what you can do with it. Try to sell one piece at a time, not the whole package.

Big difference between outreach and communication plan. ESIP should focus on outreach.

What is the cost of not using ESIP? Would decision be different? Could look at some good applications and then compare with other similar circumstances where ESIP was not used.

Replicate applications from jurisdiction to jurisdiction.

Problem of competing indicator models (DFO ESIM versus New England Aquarium). ESIP can complement existing models somehow....should they be reconciled? Should look into reconciliation, especially around social and economic impacts. It's up to each jurisdiction to reconcile environmental and socio-economic information. E.g., Gulfwatch is a good model for reconciling monitoring across the border.

ESIP can be a solution to complicated models that we currently have. Not bureaucratic. This speaks to real people with real issues. ESIP can complement what we are currently doing.

Are projects fundable?

Can hook any of these projects to a number of other things, but need to decide what you want to pick. Test whether we can apply a project internationally to show replication.

Could apply for funds from multiple foundations to fund different pieces of ESIP. Need good connection between application and user.

What will motivate foundations to support indicator work? Need to prioritize audiences. Use 2 strategies: use 'one sector' approach (e.g., how is ESIP useful to shellfish industry?) Also need to use at macro level (enlist RARGOM) and determine whether organizations will use it.

Fund funding to apply ESIP in locale, or particular type of project to replicate. Will help with evaluation – because evaluation is hard to fund alone.

ESIP also has plans to produce scientific papers on sea level rise, sea surface temperature, and shellfish sanitation. They also want to do fact sheets on sea level rise, sea surface temperature, Gulfwatch, and sediment triad.

Summary submitted by Betsy Nicholson, NOAA

Work session on Climate Change Funding summary:

Participants: Adrianne Harrison, NOAA; Larry Hildebrand, Environment Canada; Julia Knisel, MA CZM; Cindy Krum, Gulf of Maine Association; Marianna Vulli, CLF

Summary:

Focused discussion on three climate project concepts -

- 1. Analysis of Economic Impacts of Climate Change
- 2. Building the Storm Smart Coasts Network
- 3. Climate Change Criteria for Restoration Projects

Project Definitions: Ways to make projects more attractive/interesting – be clear on what GOMC wants to do Define expected impacts Define expected outcomes

Review of Project Concepts:

- 1. Framework Climate adaptation planning framework for states and the region around which they can develop their plan
- 2. Planning Assistance identifying planning activities in five jurisdictions, looking for common activities, and move forward with funding for planning assistance
- 3. Targets underlying the planning is need for refined target numbers to do the second generation of plans; indicators



- 4. Economic Impact Assessment tools to assess economic impacts of climate change, evaluate strengths and weaknesses, funding to test tool in communities and gather data to develop more robust tools
- 5. Restoration and Conservation Priorities connecting to climate change impacts creating more robust habitat corridors based on migration projections of habitat; working with restoration grants to address
- Communication articulating on the ground experiences in the community; demonstrating future impacts; shared message
- 7. Networking web network/resource highlighting tools and information; building community of practice and forum discussions; goal is to reach the local community with this network

Discussion of Project Concepts:

 Economic Impact Assessment – Interesting to funders with adaptation interests; not developing a tool, but evaluating a tool, develop clearinghouse, perhaps pilot tool in communities that have need for tool. Foundation could see this as their money going further – support evaluation of tool, support council to work with localities apply tool, get result, and then sharing results. Relicable/transferable to other locations. Dissemination component – make sure share with municipality association.

Are there other projects that can be built on related to economic information and tool development?

2. StormSmart Network – transferable/replicable

Expanding network and engaging network. Building on existing. Community of practice for states/feds; municipalities are consumers of information/end user.

Resonate with funders – looking to educate – Canadian funder best suited for expanded. Complete network examples in addition to expanding. Expand engagement piece of proposal. Virtual forums – moderated discussion monthly. Outcomes of this? 1. Access information. 2. Identify communities for next round of pilot projects. 3. Share past successes and transfer process. 4. Document additional case studies.

Guidance and tools to municipalities. Climate impacts for Charlottetown PEI – very detailed, but locals couldn't cope with addressing information. Same with New Brunswick. Caution – seeming legitimate objective for reaching local decision-makers, but not having capacity.

Other options - model ordinance etc.

3. Restoration -

Refine or inform thinking about how to fund restoration projects given climate predictions. Inform priorities for grants.

Broaden beyond sea level rise - gets into species at risk, migration, etc.

Framework/criteria to evaluate projects – connect to GOM Restoration and Conservation Initiative Plan; NFWF grants – deadlines in April?

Look for other orgs using climate criteria evaluation projects

TNC might be a good a partner

Vulnerability assessments.

Research Regional Adapation Collaborative components and leverage CAN investments/pilots Pew is a research funder.

Consider - looking for similar projects the materials will list funders of who funded that effort.

Ocean Acidification as climate issue for GOMC to become involved in?

Gulfwatch – Pew potential funder

Follow up actions:



- climate adaptation search from Marianna/CLF; Heinz Family Foundation state adaptation planning, local level adaptation – already understand adaptation.
- bring additional Canadians to conference call
- Rob ARAC project descriptions; Climate adaptation solutions Center created to run program.
- What's driving philanthropic interest in cc/adaptation in Canada

Summary submitted by Adrianne Harrison, NOAA

Work session on the Gulf of Maine Times summary:

Participants: Theresa Torrent Ellis, Rob Capozi, Cathy Colletti,

Questions/issues for the Working Group

Instructions: Please brainstorm the following questions.

A. Learning from others

- 1. Are there some organizations that produce applicable, on-line editions of newspapers or newsletters that may offer distribution or funding ideas we should know about? *Working Waterfront, ACZIC, MCZM, Atlantic Coastwatch, Grist, Ideal Byte. New Stewardship Canada Site under construction. Ask Larry H for more ideas*
- 2. Where should the Council look to uncover best practices concerning on-line distribution techniques that could be applied to the GOM Times? ???????

B. Raising funds

- 1. The intent is for the Times to be produced 3-4 times a year (and ideally in hard-copy and on-line). What creative funding ideas do you have that the Council should consider for the Times? Possibly solicit companies to support thematic issues of the Times with the understanding that all content remains in control of the Times editorial review process. Would agencies/others be willing to pay for a part of each issue?? It seems that we have had positive responses from EC, DFO and DOI. In addition if they have a budget to cover outreach and education around a specific issue could the Times partner with them to meet this objective?? (Point to remember: The Times is a Journal: not partisan, is educational our pitch! Benefits for both would be \$\$ to fund the coverage of relevant and meaningful topics.)
- 2. How can we increase in-kind services and donations? What are ways to reach out to science writers/public relations professionals in our Gulf of Maine family? What about sources of free or donated photos?

C. Recruiting new readers

1. How can the Council more effectively use the e-mailing lists of its member agencies to notify these people of the GOM Times and to dramatically increase the number of readers visiting the GOM Times web site? (We could take the approach of adding people and making it easy for them to unsubscribe if they wish. Yes to this!!) Provide the email announcement for them to send to their lists. Most groups will not send us their email lists.

2. How might we approach non-profits and agencies of the GOM Council family to notify their readers bout the Gulf of Maine Times? Responses for both 1and 2: Make sure that the postcard mailing is moving forward. Have more subscribers (notation says "Tim's staff person"???) The question to be answered is how to "best manage" the shift to online and what are the applicable examples. Website project pages and E-Zone newsletter must have the option to subscribe, one way to capture emails is through a simple ask for an email if they are interested in this particular subject. SOER information will be updated and this will provide another point of contact to capture emails. Constant contact lists and NGO data base need to be current and they need to be the critical communication with partners who would be willing to share the information in regards to the Times. Industry/ companies such as Irving Oil who have huge newsletters which often contain coastal content. Sponsorship? Who is the Bill Borland today? They were previously involved in the GPAC process. Would Arthur Irving be interested?? Connection with the Acadian Center for Estuarine Research. Hook up to



electronic bulletins. Coastal communities of NS newsletter. "Hook, Line and Thinker" NS-FSRS (Patty King). Random....."Adopt an issue of the Times"

3. How can we get more Council agencies (and others) to have a "hotlink/button" on their web site that connects their viewers to the GOM Times site? *We need to ask them! Start with relationships that exist on the WG and Council and provide the actual button with directions for implementing – Jim C ????*

4. Would it be reasonable to ask WG members to send 20 names of people/organizations in their jurisdictions to the editor. Build in incentives. If we send them something fun to send to their members. A cute New Year message perhaps with the Times website and and the option to sign up on line. (A noted thought that I am not sure how to put into this context. "We all have web presence – assumption – we support the Times.)

5. Could WG and Committee members take sign-up sheets to coastal conferences and workshops that request people to provide their email address (so they can receive notices of when a new edition of the Times is available)? Standard post cards/notices could also be distributed at the registration desk. Yes, Outreach can begin to build a list of opportunities in the next 6 months such as Fishermen's Forum. Outreach Committee needs to develop a strategy.

D. Expanding the content

An on-line paper offers the opportunity to more frequently engage the target audiences. This means that content needs to be continually refreshed. How might we economically keep the content attractive to our readers? Use materials that are being developed in our agencies and organizations. Example: DFO generates many reports. Have ones that have some science translation sent to the Editor for copy material. Use writers from Seagrant and current materials from them for inclusion as new monthly articles...materials. Develop special interest sections that are added at different times of the year... "special stories" about the Gulf of Maine. "Thematic" – ie: Census for Marine Life. Educational Corner – In partnership with GOMMEA. Climate Change Corner – . Refer back to the Peter Alexander analysis of our readers. What other information do we now need to gather that would be more applicable to web only publication??

Some additional thoughts:

DFO would like to fund a meeting of the Outreach Committee to meet and talk to build a blue print for Action Plan for the Times integration. This should align to a centrally located meeting and there needs to be a two day commitment to this process. Need to work on strategies for WOD to raise the profile of the Times. Be clearer about audiences and what the Times is trying to do. Remember that along with change is new opportunity and we need to look to how the electronic version brings along new targeted audiences and uses. Can ones that we previously provided to be reached in another way? Examples would include high school teachers, libraries, universities, tourism providers??? Need a new look at who the new audiences are.

Important!!!

Website needs new overall presence. More dynamic look. Look to a wordpress template!!! Cool factor – What makes the Council unique???? Needs a cleaner home page with less options. Clearer destinations.

Summary submitted by Theresa Torrent-Ellis, ME State Planning Office

New Brunswick Regional Adaptation Collaborative

Rob presented an overview of the New Brunswick Regional Adaptation Collaborative. Atlantic communities are already experiencing the effects of climate change and this is expected to intensify in the future. Communities will need tools to make informed decisions and policies to strengthen their resiliency. The Atlantic Regional Adaptation Collaborative is a cooperative undertaking of the four Atlantic Provinces, with funding from Natural Resources Canada, designed to build supportive frameworks and resources to help incorporate adaptation into policy, planning, and operations. The collaborative started with the 2004/2005 Canadian Council of Ministers of Environment identifying climate change as a nation issue. That was followed by the Council of Federations identifying the issue of climate change during their meetings between 2006 and 2008. At the Council of Atlantic Environment Ministers meeting in Jan of 2008 the Ministers agreed to develop an adaptation strategy for Atlantic Canada. The key issues identified were: sea level rise; coastal flooding; coastal erosion; inland flooding; seawater intrusion; and negative impacts upon infrastructure. The purpose of the collaborative was to develop a framework for comprehensive



integrated and long term planning for climate adaptation in the Atlantic Region with three key result areas. Identify climate risks in Atlantic Canada, climate proofing designs, and regional collaboration on areas of common issues. The priority sectors identified were coastal areas, inland waters and related infrastructure. The collaborative is preparing to sign Contribution Agreement in NRCan with a projected start date for projects for 2010. Rob discussed several of the projects in the works including the Dykeland Risk and Vulnerability Assessment Project, a Sea Level Rise and Erosion Risk and Vulnerability Assessment, a Groundwater Quality and Quantity Assessment, and an Inland Flooding Risk and Vulnerability Assessment. The goals of the collaborative are to develop model by-laws on adaptation for municipalities; proposed changes to municipal land use plans; recommended adaptations option both structural and policy; recommended changes to infrastructure design standards; recommended changes to municipal emergency management plans and an Atlantic climate change adaptation toolkit; and build the capacity of professional engineers, planners and municipal officials by supporting learning experiences on adaptation.

Northeast Regional Ocean Council – Gulf of Maine Council Memorandum of Understanding

Betsy reminded the Working Group that at the October Working Group meeting an update on NROC and how it relates to GOMC was presented. The Action Item developed from that discussion was to draft an MOU. The major methods of collaboration include in the draft MOU include: coordinate strategic planning; ecosystem health activism; climate change activism; joint projects; progress reports; and fund development and management. The duration of the MOU is for one year so that the model can be tested and easily redeveloped if needed. Betsy suggested that the description of parties section the language should be strengthened to highlight the uniqueness of the bi-national collaboration that the Council is bringing to the table.

It was also suggested that the language under method of collaboration be strengthened to develop a joint workplan with specifics items. David asked the Working Group who would be responsible in the Council for overseeing that the elements of the MOU are administered (WG Chair, Council Chair, MandF, etc). The Working Group discussed that there were enough individuals that sit on both groups that holding a joint yearly meeting was not needed. The group agreed that it would be a good idea for the Working Group Chair to sit on NROC and be a sole representative of the Council.

Action: Discuss during the next Management and Finance Committee call (1/13/2010) who will be the responsible entity within the Council to manage the MOU.

Action: Discuss during the next Management and Finance Committee call who will sit on NROC to be a sole representative of the GOMC, the Working Group Chair was suggested.

Action: Betsy will present the MOU (with minor revisions) to the Council at Thursdays (12/10/09) meeting with a recommendation for the Council Chair to sign the MOU.

US Ocean Policy Task Force developments as they Impact the Gulf of Maine Council

Betsy gave an overview of the US Ocean Policy Task Force. The White House advises that nine regional planning bodies be created around the country in coordination with the existing regional ocean governances. The mandated jurisdiction will be from mean high water to 200 miles offshore with the ability to extend the terrestrial boundary as each regional planning body deems appropriate. The Nation Ocean Council will develop objective, criteria and guidance; coordinate with regional planning bodies; coordinate federal activities; certify regional plans; evaluate adherence to regional plans; provide guidance on data and decision support tools; and assess resource needs and provide initial funds. Two of the possible roles of the Council in the Task Force would be help facilitate the national policy\policy coordination framework and regional coastal & marine spatial planning.

Action: Betsy will keep the Working group informed of the progress made towards the development of the US Ocean Policy Task Force.

Gulf of Maine Conservation and Restoration Initiative

David gave an update of the initiative to the Working Group. On November 20, 2009 approximately 40 individuals met to discuss the initiative. At that meeting the group accepted a table of contents that came from the Great Lakes Plan. The group was in agreement that current levels of funding for restoration and conservation are insufficient and addition resources are needed. NGO community was also in agreement that in 2011 a significant request for additional Federal resources would be required. The group will continue to work on the Table of Issue Areas throughout December 2009 (page 21 of the Briefing Book). In January the states will ask congress for money to complete to the Gulf of Maine Conservation and Restoration Initiative. Throughout March and April a draft of the Initiative will be written, with a target completion date of June 2010. The NH Charitable Foundation has confirmed that they will be giving \$30,000 to the Council to develop this initiative and the Cox Foundation is accepting a proposal for \$75,000 from the Council.

To help advance the initiative States will be asked for copies of all their conservation and restoration plans so that as many as possible can be incorporated as appropriate.

Action: The list of ten recommendations to the Council (presented on p 28 of the Briefing Book) was accepted by the Working Group.



Action: David will present the list of ten recommendations to the Council at Thursdays (12/10/09) meeting with a recommendation for the Council to accept these recommendations.

Prepared by Matt Wood, NH Department of Environmental Services and Administrative Assistant for the Council

December 2009 Council Meeting Summary

Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment Council Meeting

Meeting DRAFT Summary Portsmouth, NH December 10, 2009

Councilors present: John Annala, Gulf of Maine Research Institute; Priscilla Brooks, Conservation Law Foundation; Bruce Carlisle for Deerin Babb-Brott; MA Office of Coastal Zone Management; Pete Colosi for Pat Kurkul, National Oceans and Atmospheric Administration; Tim Hall for Acting Director, Department of Fisheries and Oceans; NB Department of Fisheries; Russ Henry for Jim McKay; NB Department of Fisheries; Don Hudson, The Chewonki Foundation; Diane Kent Gillis for Rick Miles, NB Department of Environment; Kathleen Leyden, ME State Planning Office; Jackie Olsen for Daniel Lebel, Environment Canada; Stephen Perkins, US Environmental Protection Agency; *Greg Roach, NS Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture; Michael Walls for Tom Burack, NH Department of Environmental Services; and Mel Cote, US Environmental Protection Agency; Jack Wiggin, Urban Harbors Institute.

Others present: John Coon, University of NH PhD candidate; Ted Diers, Working Group Chair, NH Department of Environmental Services; Jay Espy, Elmina B. Sewall Foundation; Adrianne Harrison, National Oceans and Atmospheric Administration; Anne Hayden, Davis Conservation Foundation; Resources Services; Larry Hildebrand, Environment Canada; *Justin Huston, NS Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture; David Keeley, Development Coordinator; Cindy Krum, US Gulf of Maine Association; Betsy Nicholson, National Oceans and Atmospheric Administration; Mary Power, logistics planning for the GOMC; NH Coastal Program; Megan Shore, Elmina B. Sewall Foundation; Theresa Torrent-Ellis, Maine State Planning Office; Michele L. Tremblay, Council Coordinator; Jay Walmsley, Department of Fisheries and Oceans; Peter Wells, Dalhousie University; Peter Lamb, New Hampshire Charitable Foundation; Matthew Wood, Administrative Assistant, and Karen Young, Maine Community Foundation.

Consent Agenda

Decision: The Council took off the annual indirect rate approval to discuss further and accepted the consent agenda. Decision: The Council approved the annual indirect rate of 19.24%.

Council Business Session

Dues Structure

Ted presented an overview of the dues structure and presented option for how to proceed into the future. Ted presentation included a retrospective of how the council has spent money during the period from 2004 to 2009. The Council is in a period of shrinking budgets and the way in which the Council allocates funds are changing, with a move towards habitat restoration activities. The total cost of capacity is about \$175,450.00, with the core services requiring approximately \$165,450.00. The Council will need additional funds in the amount of \$10,000.00 if the next round of Restoration Partnership Grant is awarded. Overall there is a shortfall of approximately \$70,000.00. The options for raising this shortfall include, raise dues, to expand dues request to current Council members, and to expand membership to other regional players. Ted closed by asking the Councilors which path they would like to see the GOMC follow. Jacky commented that what Ted presented were reasonable options, however she felt that an increase in dues was not realistic for Environment. Canada. In order to meet the goals several approaches may need to be utilizes simultaneously. Jacky suggested that other options be considered. Cathleen asked the group why so much was being spent on administration with the smaller budget. Diane also requested that the administrative costs be evaluated. Jacky commented that the Council can not cut administrative cost any more than they have already and still sustain the organization. It was suggested that a cost benefit analysis be conducted in June. Don commented that he felt it was a fair proposal for the Council to look at NGOs that do not currently pay dues in addition to expanding membership to other regional players. The Council agreed that the GOMT should not be one of the services cut. Ted asked the Councilors for volunteers for a committee to discuss these issues further. Don Hudson, Kathleen Leyden, Jack Wiggin, Jackie Olsen, and John Annala agreed to on the committee.



Action: Ted and Cindy will pull together the budget information describing difference in budgets and distribute it to the individuals that volunteered for the committee.

Measuring Success of the 2007-2012 Action Plan and Preparing a Framework for 2013-2018

Action: Betsey will send out and e-mail to the Council listserve with a summary of the successes of the 2007-2012 Action Plan.

Celebrating 20 Years of the Council: Ocean Day 2010

Theresa gave an overview of the upcoming 20 year celebration and how it could be tied in to World Ocean Day. A summary of the ideas generated during the Working Group meeting are presented in the table below:

Planning element	Options	Decision / recommended actions
Event venue		Eastland Park Hotel, Portland, ME
Schedule/structure of celebration		 June 7 Day long: Working Group meeting Release State of the Gulf of Maine report 6:30: Census of Marine Life presentation by Gulf of Maine Research Institute June 8: World Ocean Day 8:00 -11:30: Working Group meeting 12:00 - 6:00: World Ocean Day exhibits/presentations high school poster session (Gulf of Maine Institute) and local art display (art night out) possible film or film festival 6:30 -10:30: World Ocean Day dinner/council recognition with "friends of the gulf" entertainment Council anniversary and other awards and recognition June 9: Council meeting
Theme(s) (one for WOD) and one for the Gulf of Maine	 Use World Ocean Day theme and have subtheme for the Council "Our vision for the next 20 years" "20/20 Vision for the Gulf" "The Gulf of Maine And The World's Ocean" "GOM: Our World's Ocean" "GOM: Your Ocean" 	
Collateral	 Posters (post them on ferries) Outreach video (can be shown on ferries) Gulf specific logo (in addition to WOD logo) 	
Corporate sponsorship	Maine-centricGulf-wide	



Banquet	 Paid open registration or invitation only (fee or no fee) Corporate sponsorship Canadian consulate sponsorship Send out specific invitations for those we want to come. Reserve a number of seats and if they are not filled, open them to the public. 	
Wall of accomplishments	 Prepared ahead of time Poll partners for accomplishments Interactive Opportunity to add achievement on site (possible intern from jurisdictions) 	
Film/film festival	 Natural Resources Defense Council ocean acidification video* Wild and scenic festival (Patagonia grant) 	
State of the Gulf of Maine Report release		
Gulf of Maine Times Support	Cooperate SponsorshipSummer issue sponsorship	
Participation	 Paid registration Web conferencing governors and Premiers Possible web conference with Halifax World Ocean Day Bay of Fundy Ecosystem Partnership 	
Media coverage/involvement	 CA and US media release CA and US media packet Poster for ferries Show our partners films on ferries 	

The budget for the event is set at \$5,000.00. The Eastland has agreed that if the amount of money spent on food is the same as the rooms, they will comp the meeting room fees. The Eastland has also agreed to set aside a block of rooms with the Government rate of \$99 per night.

Action: The Council gave consent to proceed with the event.

State of the Gulf of Maine Report

Tim gave an update to the Councilors on progress made on the State of the Gulf of Maine report. The intent is to release the report in June, possibly in conjunction with the 20 Year Celebration. The products that will be released in June will include a website that contains the context document and three to four of the theme papers. As they are completed, the remainder of the 14 theme papers will be added to the website, with the goal of completion in three years. The topics of the 14 theme papers include: Climate Change and its Effect on Humans; Climate Change and its Effect on Ecosystems, Habitat and Biota; Aquaculture in the Gulf of Maine; Commercial Fisheries and Fish Stock Status; Land Use and Coastal Development; Toxic Contaminants; Microbial Pathogens and Toxins; Eutrophication; Coastal Ecosystems and Habitats; Offshore Ecosystems and Habitats; Watershed Status; Invasive Species; Species at Risk; and Emerging Issues. At least two of the following four papers will be presented on the website when it is launched: Emerging Issues, Climate Change and Effects on Ecosystems, Coastal Ecosystems, or Invasive Species. Support is required from the council to assist in the edit/review process. The idea was proposed to transition and expand the task group into an editorial review committee. Tim asked the Councilors of volunteers to be on the review committee. Mike Walls, Priscilla Brooks, Peter Colossi, Stephen Perkins, Russ Henry, and Don Hudson volunteered.



Tim closed by informing the Councilors that Council approval on the document would be needed by May. Action: The council came to consensus for approval of the workplan. Action: The council came to consensus for approval to have the task group continue as an editorial committee.

Action: The council came to consensus to support the June website deadline.

ESIP 2009 Progress

Christine gave an overview of ESIP focusing on how people can find, retrieve, and use the data. When beginning to use the ESIP webpage an individual is presented with a monitoring map that indicates where data is being collected. From there a user can use the indicator reporting tool to retrieve the data. The indicator reporting tool can also be used to create Arcview type maps and graphs from the data. There is also a tool on the website to save the project information an individual works on as a .pdf file so that the analysis may be duplicated or updated at a later date. Christine asked for the Councils assistance with locating individual to assist in restarting the fisheries subcommittee, locating an individual to help with watershed delineation for a coastal development subcommittee, getting the word out about these innovative and the usefulness of the ESIP tools, and obtaining funding to spotlight the usefulness of ESIP's indicators for weighing specific issues/decisions in the member States and Provinces. The group concluded that ESIP should be considered as one of the core services of the Council.

Great Waters Initiative - Gulf of Maine Conservation and Restoration Initiative

David gave an update of the initiative to the Councilors. The Initiative provides an opportunity to advance restoration and conservation in the GOM. Two primary paths have been considered for the initiative, an umbrella plan and the creation of an advocacy coalition. Peter Lamb of the NH Charitable Foundation, commented that money set aside for conservation and restoration projects could entice interested foundations to step in with grants for facility capacity building of the organization, which is the direction many foundations are heading. To date the GOMC has received \$30,000 from the NH Charitable Foundation is applying to the Cox Foundation for capacity building. Currently the Initiative is putting its effort into an appropriation request to Congress to request \$40 million to support projects, with approximately \$8 million earmarked for each state. There were three options proposed to the Working Group concerning the role the GOMC should play. The Working Group recommendation to the Council is that the GOMC should work as regional facilitator. John asked David for a clarification on the difference between the convener and the facilitator. A facilitator would take a lead role in bringing participants together help provide structure to the group where as the convener would be more active in providing direction to the group and deciding what is done. Some of the Councilors were concerned that this initiative may have the capacity to replace the GOMC in the future. The councilors agreed that a more detailed discussion was need at the next Council meeting in June so that they can gain a better understanding of the difference and how this may impact the individuality of GOMC as an organization. The councilors asked how the initiative would proceed should the Council decline to support behind it at this time. The response was that these are individuals currently advocating for the Gulf of Maine Conservation and Restoration Initiative, for the most part it will continue to move forward without the Council's involvement.

Action: David will present a detailed discussion of the Gulf of Maine Conservation and Restoration Initiative at the June 2010 Council meeting, which will include a discussion of the GOMC role.

Action: An agenda item will be added to the Working Group's March 2010 meeting to continue the Gulf of Maine Conservation and Restoration Initiative discussion with a goal of developing clear directions to be presented to the Councilors at the June 2010 Council meeting.

Action: Invite members of the coalition to speak at the June 2010 Council meeting so that the Councilors can gain another perspective on what they envision as the role of the GOMC in the initiative.

GOMC Science Perspective and RARGOM Symposium Meeting and Council Response

John gave an overview of the 2009 Gulf of Maine Symposium, which was well attended with 240 participants and 141 presentations.

Update on US Interagency Ocean Policy Task Force Report and its Potential Benefits and Role for the GOMC Mel and Betsy gave an overview of the US Ocean Policy Task Force. The White House advises that nine regional planning bodies be created around the country in coordination with the existing regional ocean governance. The mandated jurisdiction will be from mean high water to 200 miles offshore with the ability to extend the terrestrial boundary as each regional planning body deems appropriate. The Nation Ocean Council will develop objective, criteria and guidance; coordinate with regional planning bodies; coordinate federal activities; certify regional plans; evaluate adherence to regional plans; provide guidance on data and decision support tools; and assess resource needs and provide initial funds. The expectations of the region may include identify regional objectives; identify existing efforts and build on them; stakeholder involvement; conduct scientists and technical experts; and conduct regional assessment. Two of the possible roles of the Council in the Task Force would be help facilitate the national policy\policy coordination framework and regional coastal & marine spatial planning. Tim suggested that the Council continue the ongoing dialogue with the Canadian officials as this follows very closely with what Canada has already



put together. There is language in the plan that allows each region to start at the sub-region level, which could lead to the use of the GOMC Action Plan. Betsy followed up the discussion of the task force with a presentation of the Northeast Regional Ocean Council – Gulf of Maine Council Memorandum of Understanding. The major methods of collaboration include in the draft MOU include: coordinate strategic planning; ecosystem health activism; climate change activism; joint projects; progress reports; and fund development and management. The duration of the MOU is for one year so that the model can be tested and easily redeveloped if needed. The Secretariat would be in charge of carrying through the MOU and making sure it is followed. The Canada representatives requested an opportunity to examine the draft MOU before it is signed by the Council. The Council was in agreement that a thorough examination of the MOU will occur before it is signed by the Council Chair.

Action: Betsy will send the draft MOU to the Councilors via the Council's listserve so that their respective jurisdictions may have an opportunity to review and comment on the MOU.

Action: The Council came to consensus that comments will be due on January 15, 2010. Following the comment period the Council gave authority for Mike to sign the MOU, baring no major changes are requested. Action: Tim and Russ will discuss the MOU with the Regional Ocean Council to determine if the development of a similar MOU is warranted. Their findings will be presented at the June 2010 Council meeting.

Gulf of Maine Time: A Strategy for Sustainability

Theresa gave an overview of the Gulf of Maine Times (GOMT) and it current status. The GOMT is an objective, factual newspaper that is distributed to over 12,000 readers. The council has trimmed costs by discontinuing paper copies creating an on-line based quarterly publication. The times should remain an on-line voice for the Gulf of Maine and a quality communication and outreach tool for the GOMC. One of the new features of the on-line version is a comments section for readers. With this new feature comments about the content can be tracked and the audience of readers better understood. The Council does not have an ability to sustain the GOMT by relying solely on volunteers form the jurisdictions. There is currently a funding committed through the Department of the Interior for one more addition. Environment Canada is also working to obtain funding for an additional addition. The costs are approximately \$12,000.00 per addition. Theresa requested that the Councilors give their commitment to add the GOMT as a core service. Without the commitment of the Council there is a chance that each edition to the GOMT may be it last.

Action: The Council came to consensus that the Gulf of Maine Time should be added to the Councils core services. Action: The Council Twitter and Facebook pages will be reactivated.

Atlantic Regional Adaptation Collaborative

Diane presented an overview of the New Brunswick Regional Adaptation Collaborative. Atlantic communities are already experiencing the effects of climate change and this is expected to intensify in the future. Communities will need tools to make informed decisions and policies to strengthen their resiliency. The Atlantic Regional Adaptation Collaborative is a cooperative undertaking of the four Atlantic Provinces, with funding from Natural Resources Canada, designed to build supportive frameworks and resources to help incorporate adaptation into policy, planning, and operations. The collaborative started with the 2004/2005 Canadian Council of Ministers of Environment identifying climate change as a nation issue. That was followed by the Council of Federations identifying the issue of climate change during their meetings between 2006 and 2008. At the Council of Atlantic Environment Ministers meeting in January of 2008 the Ministers agreed to develop an adaptation strategy for Atlantic Canada. The key issues identified were: sea level rise; coastal flooding; coastal erosion; inland flooding; seawater intrusion; and negative impacts upon infrastructure. The purpose of the collaborative was to develop a framework for comprehensive integrated and long term planning for climate adaptation in the Atlantic Region with three key result areas -- Identify climate risks in Atlantic Canada, climate proofing designs, and regional collaboration on areas of common issues. The priority sectors identified were coastal areas, inland waters and related infrastructure. The collaborative is preparing to sign Contribution Agreement in NRCan with a projected start date for projects for 2010. Diane discussed several of the projects in the works including the Dykeland Risk and Vulnerability Assessment Project, a Sea Level Rise and Erosion Risk and Vulnerability Assessment, a Groundwater Quality and Quantity Assessment, and an Inland Flooding Risk and Vulnerability Assessment. The goals of the collaborative are to develop model by-laws on adaptation for municipalities; proposed changes to municipal land use plans; recommended adaptation options and policy; recommended changes to infrastructure design standards; recommended changes to municipal emergency management plans and an Atlantic climate change adaptation toolkit; and build the capacity of professional engineers, planners and municipal officials by supporting learning experiences on adaptation. Other climate change adaptation projects are being developed by the Insurance Bureau of Canada; Canadian Institute of Planners; and the North Shore MicMac District Council.

Joint Council and Foundation Session

Peter Lamb gave an overview of some of the concerns and realizations that foundations have had in recent years. Peter indicated that funders have identified that marine issues are so much more complex then terrestrial issues and



that funders are always interested in learning how to gain access to an issue. David presented a context of how Council activities can help bridge this gap through ecologically sustainable development, ecosystem based planning and management, environment protection through precaution, and public information and participation. Some of the key issues facing the Gulf of Maine include: habitat conservation restoration; managing competing issues and their cumulative impacts on coastal and ocean environment; mitigating and adaptation to a changing climate; connection people with their environments, enabling them to be good stewards, and creating the political will to act; and coastal community economic and social vibrancy. The Council be a resource to funders through bi-national public/private partnership with technical, communication, outreach/behavior change, and science expertise: through building the capacity of non-profit organizations to restore coastal habitats; and through Council participation at June 2010 World Ocean Day, specifically with recognizing/celebrating achievements. Peter asked the group what they thought were the key issues in the Gulf of Maine. Some of the responses included: climate change: restoration of ecosystem function and resilience: marine fisheries resources; red tide / water quality and how much does nitrogen loading and climate change exacerbate this problem; balancing the political and economic value of working to improve environmental health; lack of political mandates to move projects; restoration and protection of habitat need to include deep water habitats in the Gulf of Maine; consistency in restoration projects on what values are restored; integrated management; and convey ideas and the "science" to the public so that they can understand them.

June meeting plans and closing remarks

Action: Mike will chair the June 2010 meeting in Portland Maine. Action: Awards will now be during the winter Working Group and Council meeting, nomination forms will be e-mailed out in a few months.

Prepared by Matt Wood, NH Department of Environmental Services and Administrative Assistant for the Council

Climate Change Committee

Outline

- Climate Change Network Event held October 7th.
- Engagement on producing Theme Papers for SOER.
- Regional Adaptation Collaborative
- Review of importance of Network to Environment Canada priorities.

Climate Change Network Event:

At the last Gulf of Maine WG Meetings, a summary of the Climate Change Network Event was presented as a briefing note.

A summary of the Meeting and the presentations are still planned to be posted on the CCN website. Thanks are due to Adrianne Harrison and Ellen Mecray for the development and wrap-up of proceedings.

Future events were strongly recommended but funding such events through efforts of Environment Canada may be difficult. While EC is supportive of these events and any movement on the topic of climate change in general is seen as positive, it is unlikely that new money will be available over the next few years to fund either events or network development.

Theme Papers for SOER

The Climate Change Network fully supports efforts to write, review and complete climate change Theme Papers for the State of the Environment Report (SOER). Expertise is available to provide reviews of papers. As well, Environment Canada has provided funding (fiscal 2009-2010) for the production of one of the proposed papers.

Regional Adaptation Collaborative

In August of 2008, Atlantic Canada's proposal to collaborate on over 50 projects related to adaptation to coastal impacts was accepted by Natural Resources Canada's Climate Change Impacts and Adaptation Program, thereby establishing a Regional Adaptation Collaborative (RAC). Funding for the RAC will soon be ratified and be approximately \$3M Cdn, to be matched by cash and in-kind partners including the four provinces and private sector.



The Climate Change Network maintains a close relationship with a number of the same partners and will follow the numerous projects and their results as they roll out over the next 2 years. Synergies with projects in New England will continue to be explored including potential funding opportunities.

Environment Canada Priorities

Environment Canada Atlantic has reviewed current Gulf of Maine priorities and, with regard to climate change issues, agrees with any proposed direction that incorporates climate change information on a regional level into the decision making process.

This means that emphasis on climate change impacts on the marine environment is important and should continue. However more attention should be paid to the impacts to coastal environments and the watersheds that feed them.

Proposed Next Steps

- 1. Continue efforts to finance Network activities.
- 2. Start planning for next CCN event next fall.

Submitted by Gary Lines 17 March 2010

Gulfwatch Contaminants Monitoring Subcommittee

Introduction

Gulfwatch has been running since 1993 and has provided a reliable long-term data set on the levels and distribution of toxic substances in coastal waters of the GOM and Bay of Fundy, as determined through tissues burdens on chemicals in mussel (*Mytilus edulis*) tissues. The data and reports are used by a wide range of program managers and decision makers in the sponsoring agencies of the Council and others, such as shellfish regulators, oil spill response personnel, fish plant operators (for mussel lease areas), industrial pollution control engineers, as well as by scientists involved in state of the gulf reporting (ESIP, etc), and others. These and other uses are well documented in our five year review reports. Gulfwatch is the longest running program of its type in the Gulf and as such, provides a vital overview of some of the anthropogenic chemicals that the Gulf and its ecosystems are exposed to, and at what levels, as determined by bivalve bioavailability. Gulfwatch's reports and primary papers are amongst the most used i.e. cited of GOMC's publications, both regionally and internationally. Gulfwatch gives the Council's work both community and scientific visibility, as it is a hands on, on the ground/in the water monitoring program, directly involving Council agencies, personnel and volunteers. *Funding for FY 2010-11*

Funding for the continued program was discussed at the December 2009 Council working group meeting. Current funding has kindly come under the Health of the Oceans (HOTO) envelope of the Canadian Oceans Act, the component transferred to Environment Canada. Funding for this coming FY (April 2010-March 2011) is required for data management, sampling (Fall 2010), preparation of the 2009 data report, and 2010 sample analysis. It is anticipated that the latter, the 2010 sample analysis, will have to await funding that is external to the HOTO funding or other Council sources.

Status of Current Gulfwatch Program

Sampling and sample transfer for 2009 have been successfully completed. Analyses are proceeding for the metals (Battelle labs) and the organics (EC's Moncton labs). At the same time, the multi-year synthesis report is corrected and being completed and will shortly go onto the website. Several papers from this report are planned, and the first is underway, on mercury in GOM coastal foodwebs (G.Harding). A Spring meeting of the Gulfwatch team will take place to ensure data management and use, move the papers ahead, ensure efficient linkage to the ESIP program, and plan for the Fall 2010 sampling. Of note is that the Gulfwatch Tissue Archives are being maintained at the Bedford Institute of Oceanography, and that there is space for several years of samples and extra samples, should funding for analyses be delayed.

Decisions Required

The Environment Canada, HOTO funding needs to be verified at the March 2010 meeting so that the Gulfwatch Program can move ahead with confidence and without interruption.



Written and submitted by PGWells, March 15th, 2010, on behalf of the GCMSC (Errors and omissions are the sole responsibility of the writer!).

Habitat Monitoring Subcommittee

Update

The results from the regional conference on eelgrass organized February 2009 are available online: <u>http://gulfofmaine.org/council/committees/habitat_mon/</u>

The synthesis report may be cited as:

Neckles, H. A., A. R. Hanson, P. Colarusso, R. N. Buchsbaum, and F. T. Short (eds.). 2009. Status, Trends, and Conservation of Eelgrass in Atlantic Canada and the Northeastern United States. Report of a Workshop Held February 24-25, 2009, Portland, Maine.

- Canadian co-chair Al Hanson has been in French language immersion training the past two quarters.
- Work on web-based integration of habitat monitoring data has been on hold following various unsuccessful attempts to secure funding. HMSC will regroup on this effort when AI returns.

Submitted by Hilary Neckles, Habitat Monitoring Subcomittee Co-chair, 15 March 2010.

Habitat Restoration Subcommittee

Update

Activity has focused primarily on supporting key goals of the GOMC-NOAA Habitat Restoration Grant Partnership. Activities included:

1. GOMC-NOAA Partnership Coordination

Partnership members continue to engage in monthly conference calls on the first Tuesday (1:00-2:00 pm) of each month to discuss gulf-wide restoration activities, issues associated with grant management, and other topics of relevance to restoration in the GOM. The Partnership includes NOAA Restoration Center staff (John Catena, Eric Hutchins, Matt Bernier, and Mat Collins), U.S. Gulf of Maine Association contractors (Cindy Krum and Lori Hallett) and Liz Hertz of the Maine State Planning Office. The Partnership's Jurisdictional Representatives are:

- Canada: Anita Hamilton GOMC Habitat Restoration Subcommittee Co-Chair, Habitat Assessment Biologist, Department of Fisheries and Oceans
- Maine: Slade Moore Habitat Restoration Coordinator, Maine Coastal Program
- New Hampshire: Ted Diers Director, New Hampshire Coastal Program
- Massachusetts: Hunt Durey Acting Deputy Director, Division of Ecological Restoration, Massachusetts Department of Fish & Game
- 2. Contracting and Initiation of 2009 habitat restoration projects

Contracts were executed for the nine projects selected from the 2009 GOMC-NOAA Habitat Restoration Partnership (Partnership) RFP round. A summary of 2009 project information is included in the table below:



GOMC- NOAA #	Grantee organization	Project objective
09-02	Town of Danvers	Boston Brook Dam removal feasibility
09-03	Ipswich River Watershed Association	So. Middletown (Bostik) Dam removal feasibility
09-04	The Trustees of Reservations	Damde Meadows salt marsh tidal restoration
09-05	Town of Wellfleet	Mayo Creek tidal restoration feasibility
09-06	Atlantic Salmon Federation	West Winterport Dam feasibility
09-07	Atlantic Salmon Federation	Blackman Stream fishway construction
09-08	Atlantic Salmon Federation	Little River Dam removal
09-09	Kennebacasis River Watershed Committee	Thompson Brook riparian restoration
09-10	Clean Annapolis River Project	Clementsport Dam removal feasibility

3. Administration/Oversight of Ongoing Habitat Restoration Projects

As of the drafting of this document, 17 active projects are being administered by USGOMA and the Partnership. To date, the GOMC-NOAA Habitat Restoration Partnership has awarded 86 grants. Projects have occurred within all five jurisdictions of the Gulf of Maine (MA, NH, ME, NB, and NS) and are worth a total of over \$2.8 million. Technical support is provided to these projects through a team approach. A NOAA Lead, a jurisdictional Technical Lead and the Jurisdictional Representative for each of the five jurisdictions provide technical and administrative oversight for each project. The Habitat Restoration Coordinator and USGOMA provide additional, cross-jurisdictional administrative support to grant recipients.

4. Submittal and provisional renewal of the next NOAA Partnership proposal

In fall 2009, an application to renew the latest three-year GOMC-NOAA Partnership was drafted and submitted. The application was provisionally approved by NOAA, with an anticipated start date of June 1, 2010. We were recently asked to revise several sections of the document, which was accomplished. Revisions included shifts in yearly budgets that resulted in the same total request of \$1.95 million, although being awarded that full amount is contingent upon NOAA being allocated additional funding. We anticipate the first year funding amount to be \$450,000.

5. Development and release of the 2010 habitat restoration RFP

In November 2009, the Partnership developed and released the RFP for 2010 habitat restoration projects. The announcement was distributed via multiple outlets, including the GOMC web page, GOMC news distribution lists, and other restoration-focused networks. Among other revisions to the 2010 RFP was a requirement that subaward projects integrate climate change considerations into the planning and design of restoration activities. It also included revisions aimed at improving the quality of applications and efficiency of review. New NOAA requirements of grantees were also included (e.g. safety plans, assessment of economic benefit, permitting strategies).

6. Implementation/refinement of a web-based grant tracking system

A web-based grant tracking system was officially launched during this reporting period. This system is intended to enhance efficiency and accountability of grant management by integrating functionality and data capture of three distinct web screens, namely:

- a) The Grantee's GOMC-NOAA Project Webpage, which is the clearinghouse for grant administration information, documentation templates, and project documentation for each individual subaward. It is where grantees and Partnership staff upload relevant documents such as contracts, reporting materials, invoices and other files of interest. Both grantees and Partnership members have access to each of these pages.
- b) The Grant Tracking At-A-Glance page, which is a tool for Partnership members to rapidly assess the status of all grants on one screen. This page provides functionality to flag late reporting, late response on the part of Partnership members to review reporting/invoices, and other situations warranting action. It also provides links to relevant files.



- c) The Grant Tracking Sheets, which provide for each grant detailed information and fields for Partnership staff to indicate approval of submitted materials. It too, provides links to relevant files.
- 7. Implementation/refinement of grantee compliance measures and Partnership protocols

Guidance materials for promoting enhanced grant administration and grantee compliance were drafted earlier in 2009 and updated since the last WG meeting to reflect refinements after a trial period. These included the Grantee's Primer for Grant Administration and the Partnership Protocols. Additionally, automated email notifications of grantee uploads, which are sent to key Partnership members assigned to each restoration subaward project, now have attached protocols to provide criteria and responsibilities associated with approval of grantee reporting (GOMC Progress and Final Reports, NOAA Data Forms) and invoices. Grantees are also sent automated notifications alerting them of upcoming or past-due project reporting dates.

8. The Gulf of Maine Restoration and Conservation Initiative

An ad-hoc coalition of state and federal agencies and several non-governmental organizations have come together over the last year to develop a comprehensive restoration and conservation plan for the region. Initially focusing attention on the Gulf of Maine, the initiative has recently been expanded to integrate a New England geographic scope. Peter Alexander and David Keeley have acted as the principal coordinators of the effort. Two meetings and multiple conference calls were convened in 2009 to scope major "issue areas", assessments of need, and to outline funding requirements to implement a regional strategy. GOMC-NOAA Partnership members are active participants in providing technical information, developing assessments of need and other functions. It's anticipated that the Partnership will continue to provide support to this initiative. More information is available at: http://www.gulfofmaine.org/gomrc/.

Possible activities and next steps

1. Continue GOMC-NOAA Partnership coordination

As indicated earlier in this document, renewed NOAA funding for this program most likely means that developing and administering Partnership new subaward projects will remain a focus of the Habitat Restoration subcommittee over the next 3-4 years. Likewise, coordination of the Partnership will remain a key responsibility of the Habitat Restoration Coordinator.

2. Support GOMC Action Plan development

Also noted earlier, most Habitat Restoration Subcommittee activities over the past year or more have focused on the needs of the GOMC-NOAA Restoration Partnership. Review of the current action plan as it relates to habitat restoration and development of a new plan will require participation of the Habitat Restoration Subcommittee. A conference call is planned for April to commence this review and discuss next steps.

3. Increase Maine's restoration capacity and coordination

With recent progress made in refining the Partnership's operations for maximum efficiency and grantee compliance, there is now an opportunity to better support the Maine jurisdiction's restoration potential, which has to some extent suffered from a lack of capacity and coordination. Efforts to reverse this trend have recently been reinvigorated by development of the Maine Stream Connectivity Work Group, which is co-chaired by the Partnership's Habitat Restoration Coordinator (Slade Moore). Through the efforts of state, federal and NGO participants, this new Work Group seeks to dramatically improve coordination of aquatic restoration activities and the rate of restoration within Maine. To date, the Work Group's progress includes:

- embarking on the design a statewide restoration database populated by rigorously-obtained watershedscale barrier inventories
- initiating the design of restoration prioritization and decision-making tools
- exploring funding options and organizational structure alternatives for a formalized and functional state habitat restoration program

The work of this group represents a long overdue milestone in the evolution of Maine's restorative potential. Given the state's historical and evolving capacity to re-establish some of the GOM's most abundant diadromous



fish runs, ongoing development and progress of the Work Group should figure prominently in the Habitat Restoration Subcommittee's efforts of regional importance.

4. Coordinate development of a "Restoration Summit"

Ecologically-meaningful habitat restoration, both at the local and ecosystem scales, requires adaptation to address advances in methodologies and restoration science. In the latest application to NOAA for habitat restoration funding, the Partnership committed to organizing a "restoration summit" that is intended to provide a forum for restoration practitioners to exchange the latest in methods and theory.

5. Continue to support development of the Gulf of Maine Restoration and Conservation Initiative

Development of this initiative is a high priority and will likely remain a focus of Habitat Restoration Subcommittee activities.

6. Frame GOMC's habitat restoration activities in the context of climate change projections

We intend to begin addressing the implications of climate change by assessing how they are likely to influence target habitats and habitat restoration policy and priorities.

Sustainable Industries and Communities Committee

Background

The Sustainable Communities and Industries Committee (SICC) works to promote and support sustainable development efforts in the Gulf of Maine. The committee pursues opportunities to enable marine-related businesses to thrive in the Gulf of Maine region.

The Committee has been somewhat inactive, although individuals have continued to work on issues associated with the Committee.

Originally, the Committee was created in response to the need for greater awareness and understanding of the Gulf of Maine Council by marine industry and resource users. Although the Council made some progress in this area through its industry awards and the participation of industry representatives on Council, the need for continued work on awareness and participation has been punctuated recently by the loss of Industry representatives from the Council.

The work of the Committee was intended to focus on the outcomes under Goal 3 of the GOMC Action Plan for 2007 to 2012. These (short-term) outcomes are:

- The level of participation in Council activities by marine-dependent industry representatives is increased
- Coastal lawmakers have an increased understanding of the relevance of incorporating natural capital concepts in coastal decision-making
- Gulf-wide industry-specific collaboration results in greater awareness of applicable best practices Marine research
- Coastal lawmakers have increased awareness of creative approaches to protect and manage the working waterfront infrastructure that marine-dependent industries require to remain competitive
- Adults living in the Gulf of Maine's watershed have an increased awareness of products and services developed with alternative energy sources or fuels.

Possible activities and next steps

In the next few weeks, the Co-Chairs will poll the original members of the Committee for their interest, determine any gaps in Committee participation, and undertake a discussion of the future direction of the Committee. The hope is that the Committee can revive its efforts, working under a modest work plan.

Action or outcomes requested

1. Anyone interested in participating in the Committee is urged to contact the Co-Chairs.

Submitted by Jane Tims, New Brunswick Department of Environment, Co-Chair, Sustainable Industries and Communities Committee



Memorandum of Understanding

Northeast Regional Ocean Council & Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment March 2009

Parties 2 4 1

The Northeast Regional Ocean Council (NROC) is a U.S. state and federal partnership with the goal of engaging in regional protection and balanced use of ocean and coastal resources. NROC's coordinated approach reaches across state boundaries from Maine to Connecticut to find and implement solutions to the region's most pressing ocean and coastal issues.

The Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment (GOMC) is a U.S.-Canadian partnership of government and non-government organizations working to maintain and enhance environmental quality in the Gulf of Maine to allow for sustainable resource use by existing and future generations. The Council represents a unique non-regulatory forum for bi-national discussion on environmental issues of shared concern.

<u>Overview</u>

Our organizations have a shared interest in the wise management of coastal and ocean resources for the benefit of current and future generations. Further we have a common geographic focus around the Gulf of Maine and shared priorities around a healthy and resilient coastal and ocean ecosystem. As such we have a strong interest in collaborating with each other and leveraging human and financial resources to the benefit of our shared ecosystem.

Methods of collaboration

Our organizations agree to partner on the following:

- Coordinated strategic planning As each organization prepares and/or updates its long-range plans it will ensure strong consultation occurs to capitalize on opportunities and minimize redundancies. We understand how our missions are intertwined and will work cooperatively to implement them, including the pursuit of joint work plans where appropriate. We commit to substantive and ongoing dialogue. We will be mutually supportive, responsive to requests for assistance and solicit advice from each other as needed. In this way we will sustain a durable and effective working relationship.
- 2. Ecosystem Health Activities Healthy ecosystems is a shared priority for both organizations. On an annual basis the organizations will assess their planned ecosystem health activities and identify a point of contact (POC) for purposes of maintaining communication and sharing information and lessons learned. The designated POCs will identify opportunities for collaboration in the Gulf of Maine region as well as opportunities to transfer ideas to their broader geographies of Southern New England and the Canadian Maritimes.
- 3. Climate Change Activities The economic, social and environmental effects of a changing climate are another shared priority. Both organizations are working on climate change policy, communications and technical assistance. On an annual basis the organizations will designate a point of contact (POC) that will identify opportunities for collaboration in the Gulf of Maine region as well as opportunities to transfer ideas to their broader geographies of Southern New England and the Canadian Maritimes.
- 4. Joint projects Subject to available funding, the organizations will jointly support projects of shared interest that are identified during the development of each organization's annual work plans.
- 5. Progress reports The organizations will periodically report to their respective boards on progress in implementing this MOU and solicit suggestions for other collaboration opportunities.
- 6. Fund development and management When appropriate the organizations will work cooperatively on funding requests to ensure an integrated, seamless approach. In addition, the Association of US Delegates to the Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment, when requested by NROC, will assist that organization by receiving, disbursing and accounting for funds that the organization receives.

Duration and termination of Agreement

The duration of the agreement will be for one year. Renewal will be automatic unless specifically terminated. Amendment of the agreement may be made at any time, by signature of both parties. Termination of the agreement may be initiated by either party in writing with a notice period of 30 days.



Northeast Regional Ocean Council

Date

Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment

Date

Gulf of Maine Times Contributors

In 2009 the Council adopted a 3-5 year plan for the Gulf of Maine Times. One approach to sustaining the GOM Times is to partner with others in producing and disseminating it. Described below is the status of 2010 outreach efforts to obtain sponsors. (Those highlighted in grey have offered financial support.) Your suggestions of additional prospects are most welcome.

Name & Contact	Request
Acadia University: Center for	2/20 email to Anna – no response
Research (Anna Redden)	
Acadia National Park (Hillary)	2/18 email to Hilary
	2/26 email to SERC Director
Bedford Institute	3/5 email to Tim Hall – contact in
	process
Bigelow Laboratory for Ocean	2/18 email to Peter Larson with
Science	positive response
Chewonki Foundation/ Gulf of Maine	1-09 email with positive response
Marine Educators Association (Don	
Hudson)	
CICEET (Rich)	2/18 email – sorry no
Clean Air – Cool Planet (Bill)	2/18 email – sorry no
Coastal Management Programs (3)	
National Estuary Programs (3)	
NERR (3)	
ACAP (3)	
COMPASS (Verna Delauer)	2/20 email – sorry no
Dalhousie University - Marine Affairs	2/20 email to Peter
Program (Marine Affairs Policy	3/4 reminder email
Forum) (Peter Wells)	
Ducks Unlimited, Canada	
Fundy National Park	
Gulf of Maine Census for Marine Life	2/20 email with positive response
Gulf of Maine Marine Educators	Don offered to explore ways
Association (Justine/TTE)	
Gulf of Maine Research Institute;	1/6 and 2/20 emails to John
Island Institute (Alan)	
Huntsman Marine Science Centre	3/8 email to Jim Cornall
Maine Island Trail Association;	
Massachusetts Ocean Partnership	2/20 email with positive response
NCC Atlantic Canada	
New England Aquarium	2/20 email with positive response
New England Ocean Science	Theresa says they have no money
Education Collaborative (TTE)	
Northeast Consortium (UNH)	3-10 email
Northeastern Regional Association of	2/20 email to Ru
Coastal Ocean Observing Systems	
Rachel Carson (Ward Feurt)	2/20 email



Name & Contact	Request
Sea Grant Programs in three states	
(Judy, Paul, Mark)	
The Nature Conservancy – Gulf of	
Maine Program (Sally)	
University of Maine – Marine Science	
Program and/or GOM Foundation	
(Dave)	
US Fish & Wildlife Service – GOM	
Program Office (Stew)	
Woods Hole Oceanographic	2/20 email to Bruce
Institution (Bruce Tripp)	

Levels of Sponsorship for the Gulf of Maine Times

Contributor -- \$500: In recognition of your support at this level we will include your organization's logo on the "Sponsor Page" of the Gulf of Maine Times' website for one year, and include a link to your own website that brings visitors to your site. Contributors are encouraged to offer story ideas to the editor and may serve as a resource for the editor.

Supporter -- \$1,000: In addition to the benefits listed above, we will include your logo, a 2-3 sentence description of your organization and a link to your website in the "Sponsors' Banner" on the home page of the Gulf of Maine Times website. (The banner is shared on a rotating basis by all sponsors at this level (or above), ensuring that everyone is guaranteed visible, front-page coverage.)

Donor -- >\$2,000: At this level of sponsorship you will get all the benefits listed above, plus you will have space in each edition for a 300-word article written and submitted your organization that is relevant to the Gulf of Maine. The organization may also provide short press releases that will be edited into articles for the Times monthly updates. (Placement is subject to editorial approval)

Council Action Plan and New Directions/Participant Priorities

Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment

Working Group Conference Call Summary • February 24, 2010

Working Group members participating on the call:

Rob Capozi, Ted Diers, Tim Hall, Larry Hildebrand, Julia Knisel, Gary Lines, and Theresa Torrent-Ellis

Others participating on the call:

Cindy Krum, Slade Moore, Michele L. Tremblay, and Matthew Wood

Action agenda

Ted gave a brief synopsis of the intent of the meeting. Ted explained how the Secretariat Team and Management and Finance have had several meetings in regards to this topic in recent months and would now value the input from the Working Group and other Council members. In the previous discussion of the Secretariat Team and Management and Finance a recommendation was made that Council should move ahead the development of a management/action plan next year, the new plan will be developed from the old plan (an update not a new effort), and that the plan should focus on the efforts of the Council not of the entire Gulf of Maine. It was also discussed that the Working Group meeting in March will include an in-depth discussion of how best to tie the Council's priorities in with that of our constituents. The questions proposed to the group through the agenda to this meeting are aimed to ensure that we frame the discussion appropriately.



Both Rob and Theresa commented that the Council needs to figure out how to incorporate outreach in the creation of the new plan, so that stakeholders can be involved in the development. Rob suggested that even if the Council does not want direct input from stakeholders, the Council at a minimum should keep stakeholders aware of progress.

1. Confirm that this is a plan for the Council not for the Gulf as a whole.

There were several individuals concerned that the role of the Council be better defined in the new plan. Larry was also concerned that constituents would not be informed of the development of the new plan and therefore not asked for input. Ted informed the group that the March WG meeting will include a discussion of key issue areas to constituents, and how to best incorporate these into the plan.

Action: The consensus of the group was to develop a plan the Council not for the Gulf as a whole.

2. Confirm that the approach will be to update the current plan vs. a full re-write.

Theresa commented that Maine plans to dedicate time and resources to the development of the new plan. Maine envisions a 3-5 page update which will include a stakeholder input/review component. Action: The consensus of the group was to continue with an update to the plan as apposed to a full rewrite.

3. Does the Council want to spend time over the next year to do the type of assessment that was done before moving the next plan forward (see mid-term assessment).

Ted started the discussion by presenting two reasons to include an assessment; so that the Council can present all of the activities that have been completed and to determine were the Council would like to focus its efforts in the coming years. Ted asked the group if it the Council should be concerned whether all of the objectives in the last plan were achieved or would it be beneficial to focus on where the Council intents to head in the future? There have been many changes since the last plan, the reality of who is doing what has shifted. Slade commented that he has been involved in projects that have adaptive management plans and thinks that it is a valuable tool for assessing whether previous goals warrant action or if revisions or eliminations are necessary. The group agreed with the need for a plan that can be adapted over time. Larry commented that an examination of where the Council is with its current actions and decided if there would be value added to continue them in the new plan. The Council must determine where to put its efforts in moving forward.

Action: The consensus of the group was to examine the outcomes of the last plan and determine what has been completed. The assessment will not be developed into a full product; it will serve as a background piece to facilitate in the development of the new plan and associated goals.

4. Does the Council want to continue to have the "support vibrant communities" since that garnered little support or activity in the last five years?

Ted commented that this question was intended to provoke thought and discussion. The question that needs to be examined is whether the Council should redefine the three goal areas or keep the existing goals as they are written? Other issues that tie into this discussion are issues such as climate change, which can span the three goals but do not necessarily fit under one category.

Action: The consensus of the group was to keep the three existing goal areas.

Action: The consensus of the group was to remain open the addition of new goal areas as they present themselves in the planning process.

5. How should the Council address the current active GOMC efforts?

Michele commented that Russ was concerned that he needs to see his agencies goals in the new action plan goals in order to allow him to participate within the Council. Michele reminded the group that this issue will be discussed in detail at the March meeting. Tim commented that the discussion of the individual jurisdiction goals at the March meeting with help to frame and address the issue of the current four-five active GOMC efforts. The Council must first assess what has been completed or not completed, and why. Once these questions are answered it will be better understood of how the Council should proceed with this.

Action: The consensus of the group was that one of the tasks the Council should add is the tracking of overarching efforts by other organizations like NROC and NERACOOS. This will position the Council to take advantage of resources and keep apprised of other regional efforts.

Call summary prepared by Matthew A. Wood, NH Department of Environmental Services and Administrative Assistant for the Council



Part Two: Charting our Course. Marine Spatial Planning Overview with Provincial, State, and Federal Program Linkages

Marine Spatial Planning: A summary of Current Thinking and Activity in the US with a Focus on the National Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning Framework and State Initiatives.

Background

In December 2009, US Federal Agencies briefed the Working Group on two US initiatives - the National Ocean Policy and Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning (CMSP) Framework. Since December, several activities have occurred to help shape a process for developing a regional coastal and marine spatial plan with federal and state partners.

Proceedings from the NROC sponsored MSP working session in October 2009 were published in December 2009. The purpose of this session was to advance shared objectives of ocean planning through discussion of data and research coordination needs and regulatory efficiency possibilities, and through enhancing the region's capacity to "think and work like a community", including state-federal cooperation, to support "on the water" integrated ocean management efforts at *every level*. In addition, the timing of this workshop created an opportunity for state partners to inform the current work of the Ocean Policy Task Force on its coastal and marine spatial planning framework. Drawing from their experiences with current ocean planning efforts in New England, state partners subsequently articulated what the community has learned about data, regulatory, coordination and capacity needs to the Interagency Ocean Policy Task Force (OPTF).

In December 2009, the US Interagency Ocean Policy Task Force (OPTF) released its Interim Framework for CMSP for a 60-day public review and comment period. The Interim Framework is designed to decrease user conflicts, improve planning and regulatory efficiencies and decrease their associated costs and delays, and preserve critical ecosystem function and services. The Interim Framework describes how such plans would be developed and implemented, and provides timeframes and steps for phased implementation of the framework. The Interim Framework provides for a regionally based approach for resource planning and brings together Federal, State, tribal, local authorities, and regional governance structures through the establishment of regional planning bodies.

NROC, GOMC, and NERACOOS submitted a joint set of comments on the Interim Framework. Comments are available on the NROC website.

In February 2010, NROC devoted its winter meeting to the issue of CMSP and discussing its role, responsibilities, and next steps for leading the development of a regional coastal and marine spatial plan that builds on individual state initiatives and meets the needs of the federal framework. Notes from this meeting are available on the NROC website. There is another NROC sponsored workshop being planned for later summer or early fall of 2010.

Marine Spatial Planning is of special interest to the Northeast Regional Ocean Council because of individual state activities related to development of ocean use plans. Here is a brief update on state activities, which will be elaborated on during this session.

<u>Maine</u> – In December 2009, the Maine Ocean Energy Task Force released its <u>final report</u> to Governor Baldacci. The Task Force identified the huge potential of its wind resource across the Gulf of Maine, as well as costs and the substantial obstacles to its development. The three primary issues that need to be addressed are technical, financial and regulatory in nature. The nine recommendations in the report are intended to facilitate timely and efficient development of Maine's significant offshore wind, tidal, wave, and potentially other renewable ocean energy resources.

<u>Massachusetts</u> - Massachusetts Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs Ian Bowles released that state's comprehensive marine spatial plan to protect marine resources and foster sustainable uses in state waters. The final <u>Ocean Management Plan</u> provides new protections for critical environmental resources in nearly two-thirds of Massachusetts' coastal waters and sets standards for the development of community-scale and commercial-scale offshore wind energy, as well as other infrastructure.



<u>Rhode Island</u> – The RI Ocean Special Area Management Plan (<u>SAMP</u>) document is proceeding through an eight step public review process prior to adoption by CRMC. The Ocean SAMP Recreation and Tourism Chapter was approved in January 2010 and the draft chapter on "Existing Statutes, Regulations, and Policies" was released for review in February 2010.

Action or outcomes requested

- 1. To gain better understanding of MSP activities in the Gulf of Maine
- 2. Discuss potential roles for GOMC in facilitating MSP (i.e. Canadian ex-officio member, Canadian lessons learned, serving as fiscal agent), and
- 3. Explore possibility for CMSP forum to share lessons learned across US-Canadian border. Propose a ½ day forum at between Council and WG meeting in June or in October.
- 4. Identify opportunities to work with other regional groups like NROC to advance MSP action in the Gulf of Maine.

Submitted by Adrianne Harrison, NOAA

A summary of Current Thinking and Activity in Canada with a Focus on the Maritime Provinces

MSP is designed to address environmental concerns and increasing competition for ocean space and resources among industry sectors (e.g., shipping, energy and fisheries) and marine conservation interests. The desired MSP outcome is a sustainable balance of human use and marine conservation by establishing the rational use of marine space and the interactions of users. MSP attempts to balance demands for sustainable economic development with environmental protection, achieving social and economic objectives in a strategic and planned way to manage current and conflicting uses, and reducing cumulative effects. The process of marine spatial management analyzes and allocates three-dimensional ocean space to specific uses, to achieve ecological, economic and social objectives specified through sector-based management processes.

Canada's objectives-based approach towards integrated ocean management within the Eastern Scotian Shelf Integrated Management (ESSIM) Initiative, for example, has been highlighted in the IOC/UNESCO report for its potential to achieve opportunities from marine spatial planning. Many ESSIM Plan objectives can be advanced via marine spatial planning, particularly reducing or avoiding multi-sectoral use conflicts, as well as ecosystem objectives relating to conserving community diversity, protecting at-risk species, reducing incidental mortality, and conserving marine habitat.

The U.S. Interim Framework for Effective Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning (CMSP) was released by the Interagency Ocean Policy Task Force on December 14, 2009, for a 60-day public review and comment period. Although final details are not yet available at this time, from a Canadian perspective it would appear to provide an opportunity for increased collaboration and shared learning at a minimum.

The DFO Oceans Program nationally has embarked on an investigation of how the principles of MSP could be integrated into its existing Integrated Management program which has many commonalities. It is seen as potentially a transparent and practical implementation mechanism for integrated management plans which are being developed across the country.

In the Maritime Provinces the Regional Committee on Coastal and Ocean Management (the senior intergovernmental coordinating body) is actively investigating to determine if MSP may serve as an implementation mechanism for some regional and local initiatives. This approach is of particular interest to DFO, Environment Canada and Natural Resources Canada as well as the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. Federal – provincial collaborative mechanisms are being considered between these jurisdictions to ensure cross jurisdictional cooperation in many areas of coastal and ocean management.

DFO Maritimes has initiated research on applicability of MSP with a focus on Atlantic Canada.

• Dalhousie Marine Affairs: *Marine Spatial Planning: International Lessons for Canadian Development.* This was a comparative analysis of Belgian and UK experience with and approach to MSP.



- DFO / Dalhousie Marine Affairs Learning Session Why Consider Marine Spatial Planning (MSP)? Discussed value of MSP as an implementation mechanism for Integrated Coastal and Ocean Management (ICOM)
- Dan Rubenstein, Scales of Governance: *The Fit between Marine Spatial Planning and Key Authorities Governing the Use of Canada's Oceans.* Examined several federal mandates, responsibilities and authorities to plan for and to implement MSP.

There is a growing awareness and desire outside of government to incorporate MSP into Canadian oceans and coastal management practices. The World Wildlife Fund-Canada has conducted some research and is proposing a senior-level workshop to explore the benefits and to provide recommendations for national direction on the design and implementation of MSP.

Questions / Issues Requiring Investigation

- How to adopt principles of MSP within the context of current integrated coastal and ocean management activities.
- Would need to develop clear policy guidelines for areas such as priority-setting, consistency, compensation, grandfathering etc.
- Need to develop science support for areas such as thresholds and cumulative effects assessment.
- Further legislative investigation for implementation and compliance. This would involve the need to explore the jurisdictional issues of the Canadian context with regard to coastal, estuaries, freshwater etc.
- Is there a need for, and if so what would the process be in Canada to garner senior level support for agencies to participate in, and comply with an MSP regime?
- What are the potential benefits for government (efficiencies, streamlined decision making, reduction of conflicts, making departmental program delivery more effective) that could be realized through MSP?
 What are the potential costs and benefits for other partners such as communities, industry etc.

Submitted by Tim Hall, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region

Update on the State of the Gulf of Maine and its Role in the Next Five Year Plan

It was agreed at the Council meeting that we would launch the first version of the report on June 7, 2010. The version will consist of the website, the context document and about 2 theme papers. Progress to date is summarized below.

Editorial Committee

The Editorial Committee has been established, and consists of:

- Jay Walmsley, Fisheries and Oceans Canada (Editor-in-Chief)
- Justin Huston, NS Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture,
- Michele Tremblay, Council Co-ordinator,
- Liz Hertz, Maine State Planning Office,
- Diane Gould, US EPA,
- Paul Currier, NH Department of Environmental Services.

Council Advisory Committee

A Council Advisory Committee has been established and consists of:

- Tim Hall, Fisheries and Oceans Canada
- Mike Walls, NH Department of Environmental Services
- Priscilla Brooks, Conservation Law Foundation
- Don Hudson, The Chewonki Foundation
- Stephen Perkins, US Environmental Protection Agency
- Russ Henry, Province of New Brunswick
- Peter Colossi, NOAA, National Marine Fisheries Service



The committee has had one meeting and agreed upon a review process that would consist of the following steps. 1.) Technical and peer review coordinated by the Editorial Committee 2.) Management and Finance Committee review followed by Working Group 3.) Council Review.

Website

Jim Cradock, under contract to Maine State Planning Office, is designing the website, with assistance from Jasmine Hayden (DFO). A sub-domain will be established on the GOM website.

Context Document

The first draft of the context document, called *The Gulf of Maine in Context* has been reviewed by the Editorial Committee. The second draft is now out for review by the Working Group, (Management and Finance).

Theme Papers

We have 5 theme papers currently being drafted:

- Climate Change and Coastal Hazards Danny Walmsley (contracted on behalf of Environment Canada)
- Climate Change and its Effect on Ecosystems, Habitats and Biota Janet Nye, NMFS
- Coastal Ecosystems and Habitats Kent Gustavson (contracted on behalf of Environment Canada)
- Invasive Species Adrienne Pappal, Massachusetts OCM
- Emerging Issues Peter Wells, BoFEP (contracted by DFO)

We expect the first one to be ready for review in mid March.

Layout

Peter Taylor has been contracted to develop a brand and layout design for the report. Some of the funds are direct to Peter; others will be channeled through the US Gulf of Maine Association. We are looking for funding to assist with the layout of the theme papers (~\$5000).

Thank you to all who have contributed in-kind and financial support so far.

Submitted by Jay Walmsley and Tim Hall, March 2010

Acting on Council's Request: The Gulf of Maine Conservation and Restoration Initiative

<u>Background:</u> At the December 2009 Council meeting the GOM Restoration and Conservation Initiative was discussed (and informed by substantial briefing materials) and Council roles were explored. The Working Group recommendations to Council were:

1. The Council should work in a highly collaborative manner with public, non-profit and business interests as an active, regional facilitator (option #2).

2. The initiative should be consistent with the Council's Action Plan and build on existing Council priorities (e.g., water quality, monitoring and indicators, habitat restoration, etc.).

3. The initiative should establish conservation and restoration priority themes and identify desired representative activities. It should not identify specific candidate sites

4. The Council should identify complementary Canadian and US programs and work to ensure they are involved. 5. Land conservation, although not a Council priority, is an activity many Council member agencies are involved with. Given the NEGC/ECP September 2009 land conservation resolution and formation of a standing committee the Council should engage that committee.

6. The Council should continue to work with others to secure and manage the planning and constituency building funds needed to perform the two paths described above.

7. The Council should understand that political support for major new conservation and restoration investments at the national level in each country are different. Further, that the capacity of current organizations to address the possible breadth of issues in the initiative varies greatly.

8. The Council's deliberations and actions should ensure that federal agencies are not perceived as advocating for or lobbying for increased federal funding.



9. Implementation funding for the initiative should be managed by the federal agencies through established competitive processes and programs.

10. The Council should document lessons-learned concerning the role of Ontario and the Canadian federal government in the Great Lakes Healing our Waters.

The Council concluded the discussions with the following actions:

<u>Action#1:</u> David will present a detailed discussion of the Gulf of Maine Conservation and Restoration Initiative at the June 2010 Council meeting, which will include a discussion of the GOMC role and implications of the initiative on the Council as an entity and on its Action Plan.

<u>Action#2:</u> An agenda item will be added to the Working Group's March 2010 meeting to continue the Gulf of Maine Conservation and Restoration Initiative discussion with a goal of developing clear directions to be presented to the Councilors at the June 2010 Council meeting. (For example, does the Council support accelerating the pace of habitat conservation and restoration in the Gulf/BoF? Are the proposed categories in the GOM Restoration Plan consistent with the agency mandates?

<u>Action#3:</u> Invite members of the coalition and ACOA to speak at the June 2010 Council meeting so that the Councilors can gain another perspective on what they envision as the role of the GOMC in the initiative.

Possible Topics for the Working Group Discussion: March 2010

- Understand three parallel paths (e.g., GOM Plan development, pursuit of \$70M Congressional appropriation, and support for emerging GOM alliance)
- Review HRCI available funding (\$30K NHCF, \$50K Cox Trust) and timelines
- Path #1 -- Understand current status of GOM Restoration and Conservation Plan development
 - States, using a consistent template, are identifying restoration & conservation needs;
 - Provinces are exploring if they want to be included in the Plan (e.g., Ontario and Quebec experiences, existing provincial plans and studies that might inform a needs analysis, implications of a Plan on provincial agencies and politics, etc.)
 - Schedule calls for the state-portion of the Plan to be completed in early summer 2010
- Path #2 -- Pursuit of \$70M Congressional appropriation
 - NROC letter describes \$10M/state for restoration & conservation activities, municipal climate change adaptation grants, marine spatial planning, and regional ocean governance tasks (e.g., indicators, communications/GOMT, etc.)
 - Governors' letters and legislative resolves issued
 - NGO and for-profit constituents communicating with respective members of Congress
 - Yes-no action by Congress expected in late summer
- Path #3 Support GOM alliance
 - A nascent Alliance has begun its work and includes a wide cross section of national and regional NGOs such as The Nature Conservancy, Sierra Club, Natural Wildlife Federation, Audubon, Gulf of Maine Research Institute, Atlantic Offshore Lobsterman's Association, and many more.
 - Work will continue to engage more interests and on putting in place the basic infrastructure needed for it to be successful. (The structure, services, ongoing costs to operate the alliance and funding strategies are being explored.)

Possible June 2010 Council agenda items

- 1. Presentation of draft Plan & possible uses of it information item
- 2. Overview of appropriations initiative information item
- 3. Relationship of Council to GOM Alliance (w/invited guests) discussion item
- 4. Clarify Council restoration and conservation priorities in context of new Action plan and implications of *GOM* Habitat Restoration and Conservation Plan on the Council – discussion item

Individuals participating in this initiative and the GOMC include: Mel Cote, John Catena, Eric Hutchins, Ted Diers, Slade Moore, Anita Hamilton, Hunt Durey, Stew Fefer, Peter Lamb, Kathleen Leyden and Diane Gould.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

- The Resource and What's at Risk The Challenges and Opportunities for the Economy and Ecosystem
- The New England Great Waters Restoration and
- Conservation Initiative
- Recommendations
- Introduction
- Acknowledgements Background
- Process
- Goals and Outcomes
- Ecosystem Investments
- 1) Coastal Fish and Wildlife Habitats and Populations 2) Coastal Water Quality
 - 3) Invasive Species in the Coastal and Marine
- Environment
 - Abandoned Fishing Gear and Other Marine Debris
 Mitigating and Adapting to the Impacts of Climate Change
 - 6) Long-Range Planning, Science, and Communication7) Measuring and Monitoring Improvements (Or
- Declines) Over Time







February 2, 2010 The Honorable Daniel Inouye, Chairman Senate Appropriations Committee S-131 Capitol Building Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable David R. Obey, Chairman House Appropriations Committee H-218 Capitol Building Washington, DC 20515-6015

Re: Acting on economic and shoreline management issues in the Northeast

Dear Senator Inouye and Representative Obey:

I am writing today to urge your support for a FY 2011 appropriation (see attached overview) to:

- Improve water quality;
- Protect and restore coastal habitats; and
- Implement national ocean policy and the region's ocean governance plans.

The New England Governors created the Northeast Regional Ocean Council as a state-federal partnership to "facilitate the development of more coordinated and collaborative regional goals and priorities, and to improve responses to regional issues." It serves as a regional priority-setting body that helps state and federal agencies and non-governmental entities leverage resources to collaborate on common regional water quality and habitat goals. The shorelines of Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Vermont and New York are vital to human health and the region's economy: millions of people depend on them for food, recreation, transportation, and drinking water. Yet, each day, our streams, lakes, bays, and beaches are damaged by untreated run-off, pollution, invasive species, loss of wildlife habitat, and other human-caused impacts. The problems are serious and many of them have the potential of reaching crisis proportions. There are manageable solutions – some already in various stages of implementation – but if we don't move quickly the problems will only get worse and the solutions more expensive.

The Northeast states, through several regional initiatives, are pursuing a coordinated and collaborative approach to coastal and watershed issues that require an inter-state response. Similar to regional ocean governance efforts around the nation's shores, these state-federal partnerships are guided by consensus-based plans that leverage local and state commitments.

This request will address our most pressing needs for the balanced development and protection of critical shoreline, ocean and coastal resources. Our work implements the nation's water quality and ocean policies, enhances the mission of our federal partners, and leverages other resources in the region. Thank you for your support of these important and timely efforts to improve the sustainable development of our region's treasured fresh and saltwater ecosystems and resources.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Leyden, Chair

cc: New England and New York Congressional Delegations Chair, White House Committee on Ocean Policy Ranking Minority Members, Senate & House Appropriations Committee Dr. Jane Lubchenco, Administrator, NOAA Ms. Lisa Jackson, Administrator, USEPA Marvin Moriarty, Regional Director, USFWS Ken Salazar, Secretary of the Interior



OVERVIEW

2011 Request: Conserving and restoring Northeast's water quality and associated habitats

Request: \$70 million

\$70 million through the Interior, EPA and Related Agencies Appropriations Act as follows:

\$20 million to the EPA's Long Island Sound Office

Purpose: Implement the Long Island Sound Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan. <u>Examples of Activities</u> – Address hypoxia, toxics, pathogens, floatable debris, land use and development activities that impact the Connecticut and New York shorelines in Long Island Sound.

\$20 million to EPA for high priority water quality projects in New England Great Waters Ecosystems (in ME, NH, MA, RI, and VT)

Purpose: Address non-point sources of pollution as described in state coastal water quality plans. Projects will be awarded on a competitive process, evenly distributed between the New England states, and require no state or municipal match.

Examples of activities – Control polluted runoff from six main sources: forestry, agriculture, urban areas, marinas, shoreline and stream channel modification, and wetlands and riparian areas.

\$5 million to the US Fish and Wildlife Service in New England Great Waters Ecosystems

Purpose: Address coastal fish and wildlife priorities and invasive species issues. Projects will be awarded on a competitive basis and evenly distributed between the New England states.

Examples of activities – Work in partnership with the states to acquire lands and otherwise protect priority habitats, including the coastal upland buffer zone and seabird islands, restore coastal marsh hydrology and morphology; restore fish passage; and control invasive plant and animal species.

\$15 million to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in New England Great Waters Ecosystems

Purpose: Address habitat restoration and marine debris issues. Projects will be awarded on a competitive basis and evenly distributed between the New England states.

Examples of activities – Work in partnership with the states to remove barriers to prime aquatic habitats that hinder fish restoration efforts, restore coastal marshes, and remove and properly dispose of marine debris.

\$10 million to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (in ME, NH, MA, RI and CT) Purpose: Implement national ocean policy and New England ocean governance plans in collaboration with Northeast Regional Ocean Council

Examples of activities – Assist coastal municipalities adapt to sea level rise; implement state climate change plans; support state-federal marine spatial planning partnerships throughout the region including the bi-state Long Island Sound; address leading ecosystem health issues through policy changes and communications; enable states to implement national ocean governance standards; etc.

Northeast Great Waters Restoration and Conservation

Revitalizing the Economy by Reversing 200 Years of Environmental Decline

The region's Governors, state agencies, Intergovernmental Commissions, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are united in asking Congress to invest in implementation of regional ecosystem restoration and conservation plans. There are manageable solutions, and delaying will only make the problems worse and the solutions more expensive.



Working Group Meeting and Forum March 24-25, 2010 Briefing Packet • Version 1



Long Island Sound



Gulf of Maine and Cape Cod



Lake Champlain



Narragansett Bay, Buzzards Bay, and Adjoining Waters

\$70 Million in 2011: a Down Payment For Critical Conservation And Ecosystem Restoration

Economic and Other Benefits:

Clean water and healthy ecosystems are good for business! This investment of federal funds will generate thousands of jobs, and reduce the negative economic impacts of beach closings, algae blooms, and fish kills that have plagued the region due to nutrient loading from agricultural, sewage and storm water runoff. It will also restore ecosystem functions and make them more resilient to climate change, benefit the region's fisheries, including shellfish, conserve important lands, increase property values, and bolster tourism and the recreational industries throughout the region.

Long Island Sound (\$20 Million):

• Implementation by EPA Long Island Sound Office of high priority projects identified in the Long Island Sound Study.

Gulf of Maine & Cape Cod (\$30 million), Lake Champlain (\$10 Million), and Coastal Rhode Island (\$10 million):

• Improve water quality through high priority projects that are competitively awarded by EPA in consultation with its state partners (\$20 million)

• Restore and conserve coastal habitats, combat the spread and mitigate the impacts of invasive species, restore fish passage, and address marine debris by US FWS and NOAA (\$20 million)

• Address priority coastal and marine issues including marine spatial planning consistent with the CEQ Framework, climate change adaptation, and ecosystem health activities (\$10 million to NOAA to be administered in collaboration with Northeast Regional Ocean Council)





Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment



For More information please contact Peter Alexander at (802) 380-3080 or cristobl@myfairpoint.net or David Keeley at david@thekeeleygroup.com



State of Massachusetts Restoration and Conservation Project Examples

The following projects are "illustrative" only, showing the *kinds* of projects and their benefits that could be undertaken with federal "Great Waters" funding. Actual projects will be chosen through a competitive process.

Improve coastal water quality

In many places the region's fresh and marine waters are not safe to swim in, eat fish from, or to drink. Our uses of these waters are adversely affected by failing septic systems, inadequate municipal sewage treatment, vessel discharges and non-point sources of pollution.

Project #1: Construct six commercial boat pumpouts for commercial vessels in six ports on the Massachusetts coast. Construction designs and plans were completed in September 2009 under contracts from Massachusetts Office of Coastal Zone Management (CZM) with funding from the Massachusetts Seaport Bond Council. Funding is needed for permitting and construction costs, with contract oversight by CZM.

<u>Project Benefits and Results</u>: Commercial boat pumpouts will support clean water in commercial ports and further the effectiveness of the No Discharge Area designations which now cover the majority of the Massachusetts coastline. Current boat pumpout facilities only service recreational boats.

<u>Project Sequence and Budget</u>: Since the designs have been completed for facilities which will all be on public land, contracts to the communities are needed to cover permitting and construction costs. Cost: \$1 million.

Project #2: Enhance grant funding opportunities for municipalities to assess, design, and construct projects to manage and treat stormwater runoff to coastal areas for the protection of recreational and commercial fisheries uses. Massachusetts CZM already runs a small grant program using state bond funds and federal grant funds, when available, to support proposals from municipalities for mitigating the impacts of storm water to coastal waters. Demand always exceeds available funds.

<u>Project Benefits and Results</u>: Improved protection for recreational and commercial fisheries in coastal waters. Removal of segments from the MA DEP list of impaired waters.

<u>Project Sequence and Budget</u>: (e.g., likely range of costs): CZM, with support from MA DEP, would expand opportunities for municipal stormwater control projects to meet local priorities. Cost: \$1.5 million/year.

Protect and restore fish and wildlife habitat and populations

Fish and wildlife habitats throughout New England have been affected by 200 years of use and development. For example, rivers draining to the sea have barriers to fish passage, coastal salt marshes have been drained and filled, and development has impacted the habitats humans rely on for work and pleasure.

Project #1: Town Creek Estuary Restoration. The MA Division of Ecological Restoration (DER) is partnering with the Town of Salisbury to restore tidal flow to a 100+ acre former estuary near the mouth of the Merrimack River. Tidal flow was cut off from the estuary over 100 years ago by construction of a railroad embankment across Town Creek, resulting in upstream flooding problems and severe degradation of wetland habitats. The town would apply for funding to reconstruct the railroad embankment culvert infrastructure to restore tidal flow.

<u>Project Benefits and Results</u>: This project will enhance tidal range and flushing to over 100 acres of degraded coastal wetlands located just upriver of the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge and Great Marsh Area of Critical Environmental Concern. Benefits will include restoration of habitat for numerous commercial and recreational fish species, migratory waterfowl, and many other life forms that inhabit coastal wetlands. It will also alleviate a severe flooding problem for upstream



businesses and infrastructure that have suffered millions of dollars in flood damages just in the past decade.

<u>Project Sequence and Budget</u>: Data collection, hydraulic modeling, and preliminary design plans have been completed. Funding is needed for final designs, permitting, and project construction. Cost: \$800,000.

Project #2: Ballard Street Salt Marsh Restoration. This project will remove fill material from 32 acres of former salt marsh within the Rumney Marshes Area of Critical Environmental Concern to re-create a natural tidal creek and salt marsh habitat. Fill material was placed within the former salt marsh in the 1950s for construction of the I-95 interstate Boston connection that was never completed. DER is partnering with the MA Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) and the City of Saugus. DCR is the landowner and would be the grant applicant.

<u>Project Benefits and Results</u>: The project will restore critical coastal wetland habitat within the largest remaining intact estuary in the metro Boston region. Critical habitats for fish, waterfowl, and other wildlife will be restored to a healthy condition, and significant flooding issues for neighboring residential communities will be alleviated.

<u>Project Sequence and Budget</u>: Data collection and preliminary design plans are complete. Funding is needed for final designs, permitting, and project construction. Cost: \$3,800,000.

Project #3: Taunton River Watershed Restoration. Restoration of the federally-designated Wild and Scenic Taunton River watershed is one of the highest priorities in Massachusetts. The Taunton River is the longest undammed coastal river in New England and hosts the largest herring runs in the Commonwealth. Federal, state, and local agencies, NGOs, and community organizations have identified two tributaries to the Taunton that could also support herring runs if the barriers to fish passage were removed. Removal of aging dams on the Cotley River and Mill River will open up 37 river miles to alwife and blueback herring as well as American eel and lamprey.

<u>Project Benefits and Results</u>: Removal of three dams on the Mill River will open 27 miles of mainstem and tributary habitat; removal of the only dam on the Cotley River will open up 8 miles of stream habitat. These rivers will be reconnected to the dam-free Taunton River and Narragansett Bay for the first time in over 100 years. The Mill River alone is projected to support an annual herring run of more than 100,000 fish.

<u>Project Sequence and Budget</u>: The project will complete final design, permitting, and construction at three dams on the Mill River and one dam on the Cotley River. Cost: \$2,100,000.

Address toxic pollution

Contaminants in the environment pose important human health risks and threaten the ecology of northern New England. Timely action is needed to clean-up toxic hot spots, properly dispose of toxic materials, and reduce the releases of toxic contaminants.

Project #1: Cape Cod and Islands Regional Dredged Material Management Plan (DMMP). The purpose of the DMMP for the region is to identify, evaluate, and permit, dredged material disposal sites or management methods for the disposal, over the next ten (10) years, of dredged material unsuitable for unconfined ocean disposal. The lack of practicable, cost-effective methods for the disposal of this material in an environmentally sound manner has been a long-standing obstacle to the successful completion of dredging projects in the region. The project includes an analysis of alternative dredged material disposal sites and alternative technologies to treat sediments for eventual disposal or beneficial reuse. The project would identify one or more proposed Confined Aquatic Disposal (CAD) sites to be used by the regional communities.

<u>Project Benefits and Results</u>: Project benefits include providing a badly needed resource for the proper disposal of low-level contaminated sediments from marine embayments, improving the water quality and benthic habitat of those embayments, and providing a source of material for beneficial reuse on surrounding beaches. The initial project would include a needs assessment, preliminary site investigation and characterization, and summary report. This phase would provide the information required for the initial permitting of the project.



Project Sequence and Budget: The project involves three task phases:

Task 1: Needs Assessment Investigation including cost/benefit analysis, marine spatial planning analysis using existing bathymetric/sediment/benthic data, data gap identification and the establishment of baseline criteria for site selection. Cost: \$75,000.

Task 2: Initial Site Characterization including field work employing sediment grabs, side-scan sonar, sediment profile indexing, and benthic organism identification. Cost: \$150,000.

Task 3: Report Generation and initiation of permitting process. Cost: \$75,000.

Total cost: \$300,000.

Upon successful completion of project permitting, funding would be sought to construct and operate a CAD cell. Cost TBD.

Prevent the introduction of, and control, marine invasive species

Invasive species are plants and animals from other parts of the world that adversely affect the habitats they invade. Throughout New England they are having important economic, environment and ecological impacts.

Project #1: Regional Early Detection of Marine Invasive Species. In 2006, Massachusetts Office of Coastal Zone management established the Marine Invader Monitoring and Information Collaborative (MIMIC), a citizen-science based early detection network for the New England Region. Additional buy-in and support of MIMIC and the online Master Invader Tracking and Information System (MITIS) (MIT Sea Grant Program) is essential to maintain effective early detection services across New England.

<u>Project Benefits and Results</u>: Coordinated early detection networks are critical to inform decision makers tasked with rapid response. MIMIC is a functioning network in New England that relies on local partners and citizen scientists. With additional resources, MIMIC will be able to expand its monitoring range, improve its education message and reach, and provide real-time and interactive data sharing through the MITIS website.

<u>Project Sequence and Budget</u>: Identify and expand local partnerships; develop improved training and outreach materials; conduct training workshops; approve monitoring plans; conduct quality control visits; compile and analyze data; develop interactive GIS mapping and real-time data sharing capability on the MITIS web page; present results to the Northeast Aquatic Nuisance Species Panel. Cost: \$150,000.

Project #2: Grateloupia Distribution in Massachusetts, impact evaluation and risk assessment. A red alga native to Asia, *Grateloupia turuturu*, was first reported in New England waters in 1994. Initially, *G. turuturu* was restricted to the outermost portions of Naragansett Bay, but in 2007, small populations were discovered for the first time on both sides of the Cape Cod Canal. Consequences of this invasion in Gulf of Maine waters are yet unknown. Additional effort to document this specie's distribution and to conduct a risk assessment for its potential impacts are needed.

<u>Project Benefits and Results</u>: The northward movement of *Grateloupia* into Massachusetts is an opportunity to evaluate this species and plan for management activities before it becomes widely established. This project will provide information for managers to better understand its impacts in Massachusetts and for the regional Northeast Aquatic Nuisance Species Panel.

<u>Project Sequence and Budget</u>: Assemble team of scientists to refine monitoring strategy; assess the distribution through stratified, random sampling of near shore and intertidal areas; collect data on substrate type, macroalgae cover, and species richness; compile and analyze results; develop GIS maps, risk assessment, and priority management actions; share findings with the Massachusetts Aquatic Invasive Species Working Group and the NEANS Panel. Cost: \$85,000.

Project #3 Development of Best Management practices to Reduce the Spread of *Didemnum vexillum*. The colonial tunicate, *Didemnum vexillum*, was first discovered in the Gulf of Maine in 1988 and has since rapidly colonized near shore and subtidal habitats, including Stellwagen and George's Banks, potentially smothering critical habitat and competing with native species. Like many invasive species, it can reproduce and spread vegetatively through fragments, thus any activity that can fragment *Didemnum vexillum* (trawls, dredges, power washing) will facilitate its spread. This project will support the development of best management practices.



<u>Project Benefits and Results</u>: This species has no known predators and currently there are no known methods to control its spread. The development of BMPs will protect habitats and fishery areas currently not affected by this species and serve as a resource for managers throughout the region. Practices developed may have effectiveness for other potential marine invaders.

<u>Project Sequence and Budget</u>: Conduct literature review on spread control practices for *D. vexillum*; Experimentally test control agents; poll water users and evaluate high risk activities for spread; develop BMP recommendations for specific water users (commercial fishing, recreational boating, aquaculture, etc.); develop outreach and education materials; share results. Cost: \$65,000.

State of Maine Restoration and Conservation Project Examples

The following projects are "illustrative" only, showing the *kinds* of projects and their benefits that could be undertaken with federal "Great Waters" funding. Actual projects will be chosen through a competitive process.

Improving coastal water quality

In many places the region's fresh and marine waters are not safe to swim in, eat fish from, or to drink. Our uses of these waters are adversely affected by failing septic systems, inadequate municipal sewage treatment, vessel discharges and non-point sources of pollution.

Project #1 Combined Sewer Overflow Abatement System – Bath, Maine. Untreated Combined Sewer Overflows (CSOs) discharge sanitary sewage, storm water, and industrial wastes directly into lakes, rivers, streams, and coastal areas. In the City of Bath, these discharges violate both State and Federal water pollution laws and contribute to impairment of water quality, shellfish harvesting areas, and beaches associated with the Kennebec River.

Project Benefits and Results: Opportunities for construction, engineering and consulting work. Service businesses in City of Bath and other municipalities would also reap economic gains. Improved water quality can promote growth in recreational and commercial fisheries, tourism and the industries that support these activities. Abatement of noxious discharges would aid efforts to restore Kennebec River water quality and nearshore ecosystems.

Project Sequence and Budget: Permitting and construction phases require \$3,181,000.

Project #2 Nutrient Modeling and Monitoring – *coastwide*. Despite dramatic improvements in the health of Maine's rivers since implementation of the Clean Water Act, a lack of estuary-specific water quality monitoring and development of nutrient modeling criteria hinders Maine's ability to identify and adaptively manage ongoing and emerging pollution sources.

Project Benefits and Results: Establishing water quality monitoring and modeling tuned specifically to Maine's estuarine environments will allow, for the first time, confident characterizations of estuarine water quality and development of criteria to measure restoration success. Improved estuarine water quality can promote growth in sport fishing, commercial fisheries, tourism and related service industries.

Project Sequence and Budget: This program requires deployment of data collectors, data analysis, and development of recommendations, at a cost of approximately \$200,000.

Protect and restore fish and wildlife habitat and populations

Fish and wildlife habitats throughout New England have been affected by 200 years of use and development. For example, rivers draining to the sea have barriers to fish passage, coastal salt marshes have been drained and filled,



and development has impacted the habitats humans rely on for work and pleasure.

Project #1 Maine Stream Connectivity Restoration Initiative – Many thousands of improperly designed road crossings in Maine are significant barriers to fish migration, and as such, greatly hinder restoration of our diadromous fish populations. There is currently little coordination between the many projects that address barriers at a local scale and the often occur opportunistically, rather than according to a strategic approach that would maximize work efficiency, use of funding (millions each year) and most importantly, restoration successes. The Maine Stream Connectivity Restoration Initiative, a model example of interagency and NGO cooperation, has developed objectives and priorities for a coordinated stream restoration throughout Maine, but lacks funding for this mammoth undertaking.

Project Benefits and Results: Maximizing the efficiency, rate, and success of restoration activities by: a) identifying/prioritizing the most serious barrier removal sites, b) improving coordination between agencies and

NGOs, c) providing local outreach, d) providing a centralized coordinating and support mechanism for the many, highly dispersed projects. Thousands of projects will require construction, engineering, consulting, and support services throughout Maine. Significant diadromous fisheries restoration will result in increased recreational, tourism, and commercial fisheries dollars.

Project Sequence and Budget: Initial phases include: securing several dedicated staff, workplan development, capacity-building, coordinating activities, plan implementation and one or more pilot projects. Approximate cost would be \$2,000,000.

Project #2 Maine-New Hampshire Inshore Trawl Survey – *Coastwide*. Since 2000, the Maine-New Hampshire Inshore Trawl Survey has performed the only coastwide, inshore assessment of marine resource populations in Maine and New Hampshire. This survey, which uses commercial fishing vessels and crew, provides monitoring data essential for managing Maine's commercial fisheries, including those for lobster, but receives no dedicated funding.

Project Benefits and Results: Continued and expanded funding of this survey is necessary for tracking population trends of important commercial species, such as lobster, that would otherwise be managed, perhaps less effectively, by using data obtained from outside of Maine waters.

Project Sequence and Budget: This project has been underway since 2000 and therefore requires no development phases. Estimated cost is \$5,000,000.

Project #3 Denny's River/Meddybemps Lake Restoration – Washington Co. A fishway and old powerhouse on the Dennys River severely restrict migration of endangered Atlantic salmon and alewife access to 6,700 acres of spawning habitat. Most pre-construction work, including the final design, has been completed through a USFWS-Maine DMR collaboration.

Project Benefits and Results: Improved access to over 6,700 acres of alewife spawning habitat, which has considerable economic and ecological value.

Project Sequence and Budget: Estimated costs are \$300,000.

Address toxic pollution

Contaminants in the environment pose important human health risks and threaten the ecology of northern New England. Timely action is needed to clean-up toxic hot spots, properly dispose of toxic materials, and reduce the releases of toxic contaminants.

Project #1 Surface Water Ambient Toxics Program – *statewide*. Since 1993, Maine DEP's Surface Water Ambient Toxics (SWAT) program has worked to characterize toxic contamination in Maine's surface waters and recreational fisheries. Most SWAT monitoring focuses on measuring concentrations of persistent and bioaccumulative toxic contaminants in animal tissues that are consumed by humans and other sensitive species. After years of severe budget cuts (>70%), the SWAT program requires expansion to characterize the current threat represented by historically important contaminants (dioxins, PCBS, mercury) and emerging toxics such as pharmaceuticals and personal care products.



Project Benefits and Results: Expanded monitoring and analyses will provide more confident and accurate assessments of risk to human and ecological health.

Project Sequence and Budget: Estimated cost is \$500,000 to expand the current level of monitoring and analysis.

Project #2 Gulfwatch Program – *Gulf of Maine-wide*. Started in 1991, the Gulfwatch Program was the only cross-border program responsible for monitoring marine toxic contamination in mussels throughout the Gulf of Maine. It was an efficient model for monitoring contaminants in large geographic areas, but no longer receives funding.

Project Benefits and Results: Reinstatement of Gulfwatch would provide large-scale, highly efficient monitoring of hazardous marine contaminants that compliments more localized efforts such as the SWAT program, mentioned in #1 above.

Project Sequence and Budget: Estimated cost is \$250,000.

Reduce the effects of marine debris on humans and the environment

Trash and debris of all types are affecting people and the environment in many ways. Fishing line and trash entangle wildlife, plastics are swallowed and kill seabirds, fishing gear breaks loose and continues to catch fish, whales are entangled in ropes, and trash along our shorelines pose risks to humans.

Project #1 Maine Marine Debris Mapping and Removal – *coastwide.* Marine debris poses a potential safety hazard and economic hardship to fishermen whose gear interacts with debris, and also represents a risk to fish and wildlife. Identification of marine debris impacts and locations would allow development and implementation of removal actions.

Project Benefits and Results: Removal of debris would ameliorate risk to fishermen and fish and wildlife.

Project Sequence and Budget: Depending on whether identification of primary removal areas is determined by seabed mapping or other means, costs may fall in the \$25,000-\$1,250,000 range.

Prevent the introduction of, and control, invasive species

Invasive species are plants and animals from other parts of the world that adversely affect the habitats they invade. Throughout New England they are having important economic, environment and ecological impacts.

Project #1 Maine Marine Invasives Readiness Efforts – *Coastwide.* Marine invasive species represent a risk to Maine's ecology and economy. This comprehensive effort would develop invasives monitoring programming, regulations for ship ballast water, and response activities, all of which are currently lacking.

Project Benefits and Results: Tracking invasives populations can provide information necessary to anticipate shifting ecological conditions that currently support commercial fisheries. Current knowledge of invasives populations can also allow prompt and effective responses. Developing ballast water regulations and other methods for preventing release of invasives in the environment is the most efficient way to address the problem and a central component of this effort.

Project Sequence and Budget: Development and implementation of a comprehensive plan would have an estimated cost of \$275,000.

Project #2 Maine Freshwater Invasives Monitoring and Removal Programs – *statewide.* These projects both feature a community funding component that would efficiently maximize the impact of state invasives efforts by involving local groups. Monitoring invasives attached to boats at launch sites on lakes and rivers and providing capacity for removal actions are activities that are currently lacking or only partially funded through grants

Project Benefits and Results: Early detection of invasives through monitoring can provide prompt responses necessary for maintaining ecological integrity of aquatic systems.

Project Sequence and Budget (e.g. likely range of costs): Costs of these programs is \$160,000.