



Northeast Regional Ocean Council • Meeting Minutes • February 18, 2010

Meeting materials and minutes also available at <http://collaborate.csc.noaa.gov/nroc>

Attendees:

NROC Members

Kathleen Leyden, ME
Mel Cote, EPA
Ted Diers, NH
Deerin Babb-Brott, MA
Bruce Carlisle, MA
Grover Fugate, RI
Brian Thompson, CT
Regina Lyons, EPA
Betsy Nicholson, NOAA CSC
Adrienne Harrison, NOAA CSC
Dave Russ, DOI USGS
Susan Russell-Robinson, DOI USGS
Tim Fannin, DOI FWS
Bob LaBelle, DOI MMS
Erin Trager, DOI MMS
Ron Beck, USCG
Bill Hubbard, ACOE
Ellen Mecray, NOAA OAR
Sarah Thompson, NOAA NMFS

Nicole Barlett, NOAA NMFS
Donna Weiting, NOAA OCRM
Tim Timmerman, EPA
Don Pryor, EPA
Jack Sobel, NOAA NMSP
Priscilla Brooks, CLF
Jack Wiggin, UHI
Daniel Martin, NOAA CSC
John Annala, GMRI and RARCOM
Heather Leslie + 5 students
Leila Hatch, SBNMS
Paul Ticco, NOAA NMSP
Rachel Strader, Moore Foundation
Jon Pennock, NH SG
Cory Riley, NOAA OCRM
Judy Pederson, MIT SG
Robbin Peach, UMass
Dan Hudgens, IEC
Madeliene Hall-Arbor, MIT
Jennifer Greene, TNC
Becky Weidman, NEIWPC
Stephanie Moura, MOP
Matt Davis, ESRI
Ru Morrison, NERACOOS
Verna DeLauer, COMPASS
Ron Rozsa, consultant
Fara Courtney, Good Harbor Consulting

Partners

John Weber, MA
David Blatt, CT
Curt Spaulding, EPA
Darlene Finch, NOAA CSC
Jen Lukens, NOAA

Agenda:

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. NROC's Role in National Ocean Policy and Coastal & Marine Spatial Planning
3. Preparing for Regional CMSP
4. Options for Supporting Implementation of the Framework
5. Engaging Partners in CMSP
6. CMSP Wrap Up
7. NROC Business
8. Quarterly Updates

Action Items:

- 3.1 Look at the flip chart information to create a matrix, tease out ideas, and reduce down the information generated at the meeting into agreements. Also do a crosswalk of the information

between the three breakout groups. Have the next meeting/call build upon the decisions made and information generated at the meeting - work on this in the short term

- 4.1 Write a Legal analysis for legislation changes in our region for CMSP and get it to CEQ, (Identify and emphasize what is unique to our region)
- 4.1 Have partners and experts get involved now. Identify who needs to be at the table, and develop a structure (or model) of how we would work together.
- 4.1 Think about how to organize and gather public opinion, how to message it, and develop common communication among all Feds
- 5.1 NERACOSS - Work with Ru and participate in regional data collection workshops to identify space use conflict areas for renewable energy and other uses. Also assist with northeast research portal development as needed.

- 5.1 Brown University- Contact Heather Leslie if there are any internship opportunities (with NROC or within our respective state and federal agencies).

- 5.1 Seagrant-Explore the idea of a Seagrant / NROC MOU (at the request of Seagrant)

- 5.1 All Partners & NROC- everyone should talk with their data managers, see how we can contribute and collaborate with others. Use this information to provide input to the NOC to hopefully influence data efforts with CMSP. Possible need for small working meetings to talk about data and needs (recognizing 60+ person meetings are not the most effective for this type of work).

- 7.2 Fed agencies need to let mid level managers know about the appropriations request and inform legislation affairs staff
- 7.2 Gather NGOs support for appropriations request
- 7.2 States need to look for champions for the appropriations
- 7.2 Let EPA NEP directors know about NROC request and larger regional request
- 7.2 Contact Kathleen and David Keeley if need more information about appropriations
- 7.3 Bring BIA and tribes to the table
- 7.3 Reconsider having a separate Climate Change Sub-committee or working group with an individual work plan.(benefit for funding).
- 7.3 Feds can develop a funding catalog for Climate Change and CMSP, if NROC requests
- 8.6 Request from NMFS for NROC to present (or at least try to get on the agenda) at the next fisheries council meetings.

Next Meeting: TBA (Possibly July, Adrienne Harrison will be sending a poll for members availability)

Discussion:

1. Welcome

Mel Cote welcomed NROC to EPA's building and introduced EPA's new RA Curt Spaulding. Curt Spaulding, who came from Save the Bay in RI, was also former EPA employee. He gave a short welcoming, and pointed out some of the "green" features of EPA new historically renovated soon to be LEED gold certified.

1.2 Opening the meeting

Kathleen Leyden (ME) gave an overview of the meeting, stating that CMSP will be the major focus. This was NROC's first meeting since the CMSP draft has come out, our first opportunity for us to talk about what this means for our region, especially with three states within the region have state CMSP plans. This isn't a workshop; it is a meeting for NROC. Up until about 2:30pm discussion will focus on CMSP in a variety of ways, then NROC has other business at the end of the meeting to attend to. State and Fed NROC reps will be heard first, other stakeholders can speak as time allows, although all partners will have a chance to participate through activities throughout the day.

1.3 Introductions

2.1 National Policy and CMSP Framework: Review of key concepts and vision for regional scale.

Betsy welcomed Jen Lukens (NOAA) as a senior policy advisor to the NOAA administrator and has been on the NOP working group at CEQ. Jen gave a kick-off talk about the NOC and NOP/ CMSP (see PowerPoint slides). There are four specific tasks for Ocean Policy task force to take on in the first 180 days. They are currently developing a framework for multi agencies to work together (inter-agency work), and also developing a strategy for implementing the policy. After first 90 days, the Task Force was charged with developing a CMSP framework. For the NOP and CMSP framework there was robust public engagement, 38 expert round tables to hear stakeholder inputs, 6 regional public meetings to get input from public, 30 day comment period interim report, 60 day comment period for the framework. The comment period for the framework just closed on the Feb. 12th, over 1000 comments were received.

For the interim report there was much policy coordination on the framework, the committee started by first reviewing the existing ocean policy. The task force proposed establishing the NOC chaired by CEQ and for improved coordination with states and region there would be a government advisory committee. In the Implementation section the taskforce developed nine priority areas. The priorities fall into two categories, first -how will US government do business, second- specific topics for the NOC to address. (See PowerPoint slide)

The CMSP Interim framework included three specific things that the report did not- 1) compatibility, 2) streamlining processes, 3) increase certainty and predictability. To carry out CMSP the nation was divided up into regions and existing of ROGs helped establish areas. The Task Force recognized that there will be subgroups in some regions because of their large areas. In the framework the Feds, states and tribes would be overseen by national council (NOC). The CMSP planning area is from the mean high water line to 200miles out, including inland bays and estuaries- also regions will be given flexibility if they want to include upland areas.

A legal subgroup was formed to determine what would be the authority to do CMSP. The subgroup concluded that the fed agencies already have the authority to plan and implement CMSP under existing authorizes and therefore no new statue will be needed to carry out this plan. Instead all agencies involved will sign on to a development agreement. The signatories are expected to carry out what was in the agreement- if a signatory sees that they won't meet expectations, they must provide written notice. The Coastal Zone Act is a huge part of the Authority but the taskforce and NOC will be looking to regions to identify other existing authorities. There will be a process to look at all existing authorities, identify gaps, and fill in as necessary to achieve CMSP. This will be done both nationally and regionally.

Essential elements of the CMSP include the Regions to not start from zero, but will need to build upon existing efforts, start with existing plans etc. Also CMSP must engage public and stakeholders throughout the process-including scientist consulting, outside fed and state, academics and NGO. There will be impact and scenario use analysis done and a draft plan will need to have EIS documentation, to go for public comment, and then submitted to NOC. One key NOAA perspective is that the underpinning of the framework and policy is science, but the problem is that the science isn't always in a useable framework and will require more research. The goal will be to identify research needs and develop information management system and portals either nationally or regionally.

Nationally consistent products developed will provide guidance for regional assessments. Implementation will be done in three phases (recognizing that some regions and ROGs are more developed, longer existing than others)

- 1) Build foundation to implement at national level
- 2) Test out process and identify issue- what will work?
- 3) Build out and scale up efforts for implementation

Obviously to implement the policy we will need money but the framework does not set out new money, but sets out how to develop budgets/capacity. NOAA does have \$20 million available for competitive ROG grants, including CMSP and NOP - a 6.8 mill increase for coastal planning (CMSP. For those who are interested, the framework comments are available the CEQ website. The next steps will be to finalize report in early 2010, then hopefully president will take action and we will get up and running.

2.2 NROC Comments Submitted to CEQ

Kathleen Leyden (ME) gave an overview of the NROC comments on the NOP and Framework. The comments are available in the meeting packet. Kathleen thanked Deerin and John (MA) for taking the lead at writing the comments. The region definitely made it known that the NE region is in the position to be a pilot project since NROC is developed and the regional body would be many of the same players. Discussion of the scale for CMSP in our region took place. Some thought there should be sub-regional plans and are skeptical about the large planning area size. There was also concern that the near shore area is where most of the issues are. The states want state efforts to be recognized and built off of. It was noted that for many state plans in our region renewable ocean energy was the driver but others want to make sure that economic development would not be the only thing focused on for CMSP.

Capacity, data, incentives, and outcomes were discussed. These issues have needs at all levels. There are needs at Fed State and NGO levels for new funding, not just borrowing from other areas. Data issues are complex, especially trade-off analysis. Also Incentives will play a huge role -using CZ Act is important, states need that authority. States will look at this as a way to enhance state and federally coordination. For outcomes, ocean zoning isn't necessarily the goal, but a coarse level plan available in 3 years might be practical.

Questions:

What is the goal? Are they required?

- A. No requirement right now, but it is thought that the president will direct the fed agencies to do this. When Feds get president direction, we will act on it. The Feds can't require states to do this, that's why it is framed the way it is. There is hope that there are enough incentives in the plan for the states to get involved—there is nothing that mandates involvement for everyone right now, but there are incentives to be at the table to help frame it.

There was also had concern that CMSP is going to the mean highwater line, from experience if RI didn't go to the mean high water line in 1983, they probably wouldn't do it now. Its going to be tough to plan in that area- that is people's back yards, cities and towns will be involved, those last few 100 feet we will encounter a lot of issues (a warning).

Q . If all agencies will sign on will there be an EIS done? Would the regional plans and sub-region plans, also need an EIS?

A. yes – plans will need an EIS- no lead identified right now, but make senses that a agency takes the secretarial/convening role.

Q. Is the development agreement a common agreement? What about previous commitments?

A. NOC will draft guidance on what the development agreement would look like, NOC would guide regions and provide a template, but regions would make it their own

Jen Lukens talked about the implementation of the framework. When the NOC is stood up---they will need to develop a lot of guidance and make decisions on how this will work. Nothing said yet, because they want to provide flexibility for the NOC.

Q. What about conflict resolution?

A. NOC will provide guidance, if serious issues, they will go to NOC for dispute resolution

Comment : There is a great importance for the NOC to provide guidance for the region/states so the states know what it's going to look like before they signs on/regions sign on to this. States will be less willing to allow for gray areas or unanswered questions when it comes closer to time to sign-on

A. Document is intentionally vague, can't include everything , would be too long, but there I thought behind everything.

Comment :The data needs are many and very expensive to get. Inventories of data then need to be maintained year after year, they will need to be sustained, rather than dwindle like many previous issues. Data inventories are not always the hot topic to get a lot of support, but most critical need. There is concern that the amount of money is insufficient to accomplish this. RI alone spent \$10million so far on their state plan with many data sets going well beyond the region (ex. marine mammal populations). There will be a need for a national data or an east coast data sets/ data platforms.

A. Recognition of need to prioritize and pull resources. There is a data subgroup and hopefully they will develop answers to these concerns.

Q. What is the timeframe for the national workshop?

A. month or two after the policy

Comment: There is a need for regional workshops.

A. There is hope that there will be region workshops in the summer

3.1 Preparing for a regional CMSP

The outline for this session included a large discussion on what this CMSP means to us regionally followed by three facilitator lead sub group discussions – Feds, States, NGO/Partners. The session will end with Susan Russell- Robinson discussion how best communicate NE readiness and position our region well for selection as a pilot region.

Deerin gave a kick off to the discussion. He recognized that RI-MA-and ME have their plans and each plan has commonalities and differences. We have a coarse level idea of what is actually feasible. Today we are only having a preliminary broad conversation—the plan is not final, NROC has not been vested as the planning body (keep this in mind)

Three questions as probes: 1) What does this mean to our region? 2) What are we trying to accomplish? 3) How will state plans fit into national plan?

Massachusetts

10 thoughts on national CMSP. 1-target policy drivers (ex. renewables) use as a vehicle for conversation about needs, 2- vehicle for building on existing state efforts, 3- build a real state/fed partnership, 4- Implement at state and fed level, 5-Source of efficiencies at the regulatory process, 6-Based on the best available science, 7-Be ecosystem/regional sensitive of landscapes, 8-Iterative plans (basic plan done quickly, embrace the imperfections then go back in later versions), 9- ??????, 10- Be practical and doable, something that can be achieved (doesn't have to be comprehensive).

Q. The Marine Spatial Plan definition is gray, is it just a plan at first? Then work on policies and zones?

A. The plan is not explicit--- MA would like to see trade off analysis done

Q. Is a tradeoff analysis in a CMSP definition? Do we want to take on a tradeoff analysis?

A. MA benefited from not tackling this in their first report

Rhode Island

Issues on CMSP- Rhode island is concerned about developing a CMSP plan when climate change is and will continue to change the ecosystem rapidly. Also, technology is always changing and evolving. These changes which would affect the plan, therefore there will be a need to constantly update the CMSP plan.

New Hampshire

New Hampshire is currently developing a state water resource plan by taking all available data, combining it, and figuring out where are the water gaps. They are trying to get out of silos of ground water, surface water, coastal etc. in order to develop a holistic plan. To develop this plan the state will need some goals of where we are headed, need to crunch and combine data, need to figure out how we are going to visualize this--but ultimately what is needed more than a plan is a capability! NH is less concerned about actually siting different uses in the ocean but rather wants to develop a way to make a decision to site things simultaneously. They want to move away from one plan, moving towards plan, data, and set of capabilities, recognizing that priorities are constantly change (ex. nutrification wasn't an issue 5yrs ago, now it is a huge issue). NH thinks we are headed towards a set of tools and capacity understanding, rather than a map with designations.

Maine

In ME the Governor is all about climate change and renewable energy. They are concerned about the measureable objectives in the plan since measureable changes in ocean health are really hard to obtain and will take a lot of time. Instead we should focus on building the process, more conservation areas (or fish-only areas) could be a measure of success, another example is the number of energy facilities sited. The difficulty in just doing a state ocean energy plan, it does not include all of the other issues in the ocean. Many of these trade-offs are political.

NEWIPCC

One of the items mentioned was improving predictability. This is very important especially because of climate change. Maybe we need to accept that we have unpredictability and build it into our management structure-- how we will adapt to the unpredictable nature of the ecosystem (esp. ocean is constantly moving/ changes)

Stellwagan Bank

There is concern that the first things that fall off the table in trade off analysis are ecologic values. That is an issue; many EMB goals would be lost. If we only carve off what we "can do" don't leave out the biology.

MOP

Its not an either or about models/data and politics/governance, but rather people make decisions based on the models and data. This require governments to base decisions on model

Comment

CMSP could be collecting the data and establishing a common set of values that decisions will be made on, on spatially explicit data. What do we need to protect? What resources should people have access too? There are so many benefits to this planning process; we are not limited to a map/plan. We should identify resources we need want access too/ then do tradeoffs analysis.

3.2 Breakout Sessions

Fed-State-NGO **See Flip Chart Notes**

Feds

Benefits

1. Prioritize research and staff time
2. Optimizing economic benefits
3. Standardize data

Concerns:

1. Ability to provide top down guidance
2. Worried about looking bad (fear of failure within the time frame)
3. State needs will overwhelm what Feds need to do

Partners

Benefits

1. Data integration and accessibility
 - i. Data collection for regulations
 - ii. Agree on standards and indicators for data
2. Spillover effects
 - i. Economics
 - ii. Ocean literacy in public
 - iii. Resilient communities
 - iv. Work with others around the country

Concerns

1. The need to engage experts on how people make decisions; incorporate anthropologists early on in the process to guide how we address the public
2. Ability to sustain the plan over time

States

Benefits

1. Opportunity for proactive decision making before permit process
2. Data–(benefit and concern)- needs to be collected in a way that fits what the region envisions, not just to fulfill the plan

Concerns

1. Data- benefit and concern
2. Governor commitment on group decision making
3. Don't have the capability to address inland or beyond three miles
4. Possibly expand federal consistency

3.3 Communication of our region's readiness

Susan Russell Robinson lead a discussion on how to get our region ready and communicate our readiness to CEQ. The strengths of the NE were articulated at the CMSP workshop and were also seen at the public hearing. NE has great University capacity and we know how to cooperate as a region. We have a lot of existing partnerships and the region's ecology is somewhat similar.

Jen Lukens stated that CEQ us NROC /NE as an example throughout the discussions and there already is attention to our region. Efforts so far have sold the region well; they know what we are doing.

To even better position NROC, make sure priorities line up between NROC and Plan. Compleitive grants will likely come out in July (\$20million compleitive grants). There is likely to be a significant influx in CZM funding as well in a number of years. To best access these dollars, NROC should think coastal, use coastal wording, and link to existing coastal programs. What is the Northeast doing is a national model. Political leadership at the New England governor level is strength of our region.

A concern was raised that the NOAA money is not enough; the Region will need money for state and regional aspects. NROC should be looking at Aprops requests for more money, and to get more money in the budget. When going for funding NROC should articulate that we are already planning (easy to work with those already planning rather than a group that needs to be convinced of the need to plan).

Deerin gave a wrap-up and suggested next steps:

1. Look at the flip chart information and make a matrix, tease out ideas, and reduce down to agreements
2. Focus next decisions based on this information, work on this in the short term

We've started the conversation, have some general consensus, and go back refine and regroup and do a crosswalk of what the information from the three breakout groups.

Jen Lukens will bring questions and needs (esp. guidance) back to NOC. She will ask CEQ what the process for future communication should be. Jen committed to work with our region to develop communication pathway to the NOC.

4. Options for supporting implementation of the Framework

See Betsy's Powerpoint

Legal analysis will be done for legislation changes, the region has already talked about this but we need to put it to paper and get it to CEQ. NROC needs to identify what is unique to our region. Since we are going to be asked to do all of this, we should start now. We have a lot of partners and expertise in our area if we get them involved now, this could be a unique NE process or be a model that can be used in other regions. NROC should decide on a structure and then identify the partners who need to be at the table.

NROC may host the regional planning body, but we are not everyone, many others need to be at the table. We will need to grow the representation for CMSP. NROC needs to look at what capacities do we have to pull this off and what will we need as resources. We need to think about how to organize and gather public opinion, how to message it, common communication among all feds.

5. Engaging Partners on CMSP

See Ru's PowerPoint

Four questions for partners of NROC

1. Who are the partners?
2. What are the capabilities could you bring to CMSP?
3. What capacity do you have / want to have to assist NROC?
4. How can we collaborate together?

NERACOOS is putting together a research portal for the northeast. Many partners are already involved. They have made some progress so far, did some web mapping to see what we can do, but is still in need of better scoping. A meeting was held meeting Feb. 3rd to bring partners together, including MA and RI, to outline what a data portal would look like. A proposal going to MMS for funding, with four tasks 1) Scoping, 2) Data integration, 3) Web portal development, 4) tool analysis and implementation

There are many partners involved in a MMS contract to identify space use conflict areas for renewable energy and other uses. They are looking to build a comprehensive database of ocean uses (Ex. shipping, fishing, recreation, boating etc.), engage stakeholders and see where they identify conflicts and possible mitigation efforts. There is a summary in the package of meeting materials; the project will be going on for about a year starting in May, with a series of workshops to collect the data. NERACOOS's role for CMSP would be to pull together as much info as possible, and vet it through stakeholders. This could improve the level of information available for CMSP activities. NERACOOS will provide data (geographic) and result of workshops.

Heather Leslie from Brown -has a class focused on NROC, researching how people have been doing CMSP in the region, and other areas (i.e. FL, CA, Great Barrier Reef). They are also researching data support tools that were used and figuring out what lessons were learned. The class will inform NROC on what worked well and what didn't, hope to aid with the CMSP process. Heather also offered NROC and its partners to look to Brown for resources, including students for internships etc. (cheap labor). The University is best suited for projects with a 12-18month timeframe. Anyone interested in hosting an intern, can talk to Heather.

CLF- has been working on -works on issues with ocean conservation (climate change and others) for over 30 years. CLF has a record of taking the need to balance ocean resources with protecting the environment (have been involved w/ wind turbines, LNG etc.). CLF is made up of a team of lawyers, economists, and scientists and has offices in every NE state except CT. In general, the NGO community has been involved in CMSP, esp. in Washington, to work to get their thoughts heard, public organizing,

and especially at the CMSP workshop. CLF can be advocates for funding and would work to build support for our governors and congressionals. CLF wants to partner with NROC.

MOP -has been involved with the regional data portal (with RU and others). They are also teaming with some partners (NCES), UVM, NE Aquarium (and others) in next 8-12 months to do an ecosystem service trade-off analysis of Stellwagon Bank area (part state, part fed). MOP is using this as an example to try out the process of trade-off analysis, including stakeholder involvement to vet the tools. If the trade-off analysis tool is deemed to be successful, the tool will be available.

RARGOM -has the ability to hold facilitated workshops and to network between institutions and organizations, however they would need financial support to be able to help.

NH Seagrant and Northeast Seagrant (region, NY to ME)-Seagrant is a Fed/state partnership through NOAA funding. The money is prioritized to do research, recognizing the need for coordination to achieve regional research. Seagrant currently has research prioritization in Gulf of Maine, and similar effort in LIS/NY Bight area. This year they have \$300,000 for regional competition and hope to increase this. Seagrant is hosted by research universities, and are able to utilize these resources. Seagrant is not an advocacy group but rather views its self as impartial conveyors of information, giving them the ability to interact with groups like fishermen. Seagrant can also manage competitive competitions well and waive fees for regional activities. Seagrant may be able to be used as a funding mechanism through the Seagrant Consortium for CMSP. Seagrant would like to be a true partner with NROC, through an MOU.

Regional Ocean Science Initiatives have developed regional plans, but not specific to just Seagrant, meant to be for the whole region. These plans have identified five priority areas and most of them lineup with NROC's priorities. They have a coordinator plus a large council (including Canadians) and are currently developing strategies to implement the plan. They are trying to get funding/partners. Right now there are no specific programs on CMSP, but have participated in workshops and projects. *COMPASS* is located at Clark University and works to bring science into policy and into media. *COMPASS* can help with consistent messaging and evaluation of those message and tools. *COMPASS* provides communication coaching and training for scientists, to get them to be able to communicate to policy and media managers. They also do research on messaging and how people learn.

UMass Collaborative Institute has a coastal ocean focus of 50 miles inland and 50 miles out in the ocean. They mainly have been focusing on resiliency and adaptation to climate change and ocean acidification. *UMASS* has large ocean acidification, water quality, sustainable practice on land, and working on the sea/land interface expertise. Specific to CMSP, the *UMass* has money for a data network, not blue water, closer to land, but wants data to be compatible with blue water (NERACOSS) efforts. They also want to put funds towards partnered effort.

Gulf of Maine ESIP is a partnership with MA, NH, ME, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. They also include many other partnerships and other NGOs. ESIP can aid NROC with the data portal. They have experience in finding, getting, and using data. They know firsthand that a lot of data is sitting in drawers, without documentation of who collected it or how—these are lessons learned from their effort. The ESIP has 22 indicators, relating to specific areas. The indicator tool is online; you can search by regions or indicators (geographically or by time). EISP also has experience working with decision makers to refine data needs and to determine what the decision makers need from the scientists.

TNC- has the goal of protecting and restoring ecosystems. They do science based planning- everything they do is based on science. TNC completed an Eco-regional assessment in the northwest Atlantic

including data, decision support tools, maps, marine conservation plans, and working with partners. TNC's top priority is to work with NROC and CMSP efforts. They have strong marine science and Washington, DC relations in each state. They can develop strategies for coordination of marine work and are committed to working with NROC. Their data will go into Ru's data portal. TNC will also have its own data portal with the data available for download. TNC is also developing decision support tools which could help with CMSP.

ESRI specializes in GIS software and geographic data management. They can assist the most with a data portal and combining the portal with decision support tools to help inform people on how design or decisions will affect the rest of the area.

Comment-

NROC needs to communicate the urgency of the data needs and management for the CMSP. There is a small window of opportunity to provide input to NOC to influence data efforts with CMSP. NROC should get out in front of NOC on data. It was suggested that everyone should talk with their data managers and see how we can contribute and collaborate with others. There was also engagement of small working meetings—60person meeting may not get it done

Collaborative work plans initiative

NERACOOS lead the first call last week and are hoping for more federal partner's representation next time. The timeline for the meetings/workshops is to hold them before August.

Q. What would be the outcomes of the workshops? How would these affect our existing work plans/planning areas?

A. Hope that the committees of various organization would be better aligned (i.e. NROC ecosystem health align with NERACOSS ecosystem health)

7. NROC Business

7.1 Coordinating with the Mid-Atlantic Regional Council on the Ocean (MARCO)

Darlene Finch from NOAA and Mike Snyder from NY (phone)

See MARCO PowerPoint and page 15 of the meeting packet for MARCO background, goals, and priorities.

MARCO/NROC coordination

MARCO realizes they are coming into regional ocean governance when a lot is already going on, esp. the ocean policy task force. As they develop, they are working to stay relevant with policy. They hope to coordinate with NROC on funding. They want to ensure they are achieving as much as possible under current economic climate. They are advocates for additional funding beyond the \$20 million in the president's budget. The worst case for MARCO would have to compete against longer established ROGs (NROC, West Coast Governors etc.). MARCO would rather stress coordination among ROGs not competition. MARCO also wants to collaborate on CMSP since CMSP will be a huge challenge for all regions, especially hard for MARCO because they are still evolving. CMSP is a large task to take on with a young organization. Also there are gray areas in boundaries of ROGs, MARCO is in between 2 other ROG. The CMSP framework has the MARCO boundary as two different lines. There are also gap areas between MARCO and NROC. MARCO would like to start coordinating in areas of overlap and take complementary actions.

7.2 Appropriations Update

Great Waters Initiative has been granted in other regions, which asks the question why doesn't New England have this? Therefore NROC merged our request with the great waters initiative request. The total request is \$70 million .

See Pg. 16 of the meeting packet for the letter to appropriations
Pg 17 has an outline of \$70 million request.

At the same time, TNC has coordinated ROGs at the national level and talked about a collaborative funding request as a way to advance all of our interest. They are requesting \$30million for ROGs and \$20 million specifically for CMSP.

Next steps:

1. Fed agencies let mid level managers know about the request and inform legislation affairs staff
2. NGOs support the request
3. States look for champions

Contact Kathleen and David Keeyley if need more info

7.3 Fed Partners Update

The federal partners' major focus is on climate change and CMSP. During their meeting the previous day they talked about the tribal involvement in the CMSP and agreed to invite the BIA to Fed Partners and suggests NROC to bring tribes into mix (1 representative or all 9 federally recognized tribes). The Feds also recommended that NROC be the involved or the regional planning body for CMSP. They wanted to suggest again that NROC should consider Climate Change as an additional workgroup with a work plan. The FY 12 climate assessment will have a regional chapter this time; therefore this may be the time to call out climate change as an individual area to best position NROC for funding.

The Fed priorities in FY 2011 are climate change and CMSP.

The Federal partners asked if NROC be interested in a funding catalog for CC or CMSP? If so, they could pull one together.

8. Quarterly Updates

8.1 Land Conservation Initiative- resolution passed at the last New England governors' meeting, all states are looking at look at conservation needs, specifically looking at conservation needs due to climate change.

8.4 Jack Wiggin announced that he would like to coordinate with others throughout UHI's Outer Continental Shelf Renewable Energy Space-use Conflicts project.

8.6 Sara Thompson gave an update on NE fishery management councils. She stressed that NROC should coordinate fisheries management councils --it will help us do our job. Fisheries councils are meeting in CT (April) and ME (June), perhaps NROC can get on the agenda. This can be discussed on NROC EC calls.

8.6 Ellen McCray gave an update on NE climate activities. There are next steps from the June 09 Federal Partners meeting. The follow-up June 2010 meeting will include state and NGO reps. at this meeting they will be looking for pilot projects that will show how we can work together in the region.

Adrienne will send out a poll for next meeting-possibly next July.