NORTHEAST REGIONAL OCEAN PLANNING:
PUBLIC COMMENT SUMMARY ON DRAFT OCEAN PLANNING GOALS
MAY-JULY, 2013

Prepared by the:

Consensus Building Institute

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Tasked with coordinating regional ocean planning efforts in New England, the Northeast Regional Planning Body (RPB) is one of nine regional planning bodies created by the National Ocean Policy, an executive order signed by President Obama in 2010. One of the Northeast RPB's first activities was to develop a set of draft goals for ocean planning in New England and then hold a series of public meetings throughout the region to solicit feedback on the draft goals. This report summarizes public comments and feedback received on the draft goals at these ten public meetings and comments submitted in writing, both electronically and in hard copy.

Many participants expressed support for the RPB's mission and efforts to engage in regional ocean planning for the Northeast. Commenters expressed support for the effort to take a purposeful approach to planning for future needs and uses and to bring together federal, state, and tribal governments to improve communication and work together for enhanced ocean management. In addition, many participants approved of the conversational and informal tone of the meetings that allowed for up-close viewing of the maps, informal discussion with staff and RPB members and other participants, and comment and question periods that were not overly formalized or strictly regulated. Commenters are supportive of the RPB's work thus far and are hopeful that it continues to be productive.

Participants were generally positive about the nature and general focus of the draft goals, indicating that the goals cover the three most important areas that are critical to consider with regard to regional ocean planning. Many participants commented about the pros and cons of a regional planning approach, noting that certain issues are best addressed at the regional level, others at the local level. They urged the RPB to consider carefully which issues should be handled at a regional level and which ones are better suited for local control. In addition, commenters called for greater clarity about causality – that is, how the Actions and Outcomes proposed under each of the three goals would help to bring about the goal itself and suggested that measureable objectives and specific outcomes be tied to each goal so that it would be possible to evaluate progress in achieving the goals.

Many commenters spoke about the data and data collection that underpins the regional planning effort. Many people emphasized that the temporal and spatial scales of data used to make decisions should be appropriate to the context. As a suggestion to address concerns about outdated and inappropriate temporal and spatial data, commenters suggested that data be as up-to-date as possible and be collected continually to properly inform ongoing decision-making. Data should take account of ongoing changes, including climate change, ocean acidification, and the transient nature of marine species and habitats. Some commenters also emphasized the need for adaptive management and quality assurance / quality control efforts to ensure that appropriate and accurate data are used to guide decision-making.

A number of participants provided input about the RPB's mandate to work within existing regulatory boundaries. Some commenters expressed concern that the RPB's work might not have much of an impact without new legislation or enhanced regulatory authority and encouraged the RPB to be assertive in interpreting its authority. In contrast, other commenters urged the RPB to remain within its non-regulatory boundaries and focus on serving as a forum to improve the quality and accessibility of information rather than developing any sort of regional plan or planning framework that might inadvertently lead to increased regulatory inefficiency.

Many comments were received about the importance of public engagement, providing suggestions to improve the engagement process. A number of commenters commended the RPB for holding 10 public meetings around New England and for the accessible, conversational tone of the meetings. In addition, members of the public emphasized the importance of incorporating public input into the planning process and noted that people tend to stop participating if they sense that their input is not taken seriously. Some commenters emphasized the need to perform additional outreach to better inform members of the public and members from specific ocean user groups, such as fishermen, among others, about the meetings and about regional ocean planning in general. Commenters suggested a number of public outreach strategies to the RPB and emphasized that it is the RPB's responsibility to communicate about the process in ways that are understandable, relevant, and personally important to a variety of people.

Participants provided the following feedback about the goal "Effective Decision Making": Many commenters said that improving decision making is essential and is one of the major opportunities provided by the formation of the Regional Planning Body. While some participants supported the idea of improved decision-making time, others suggested that the focus of effective decision-making should be on making wise, not quick, decisions. Many participants wanted greater clarity about which agency would have final decision making authority in the ocean planning process. Some people raised questions about how the regional ocean planning process fits into the broader policy-making process and, in particular, about the difference between "planning" and "decision-making." Commenters emphasized the importance of engaging with local jurisdictions and their elected officials, both in ongoing decision-making and in the development of the regional planning effort. Some commenters advocated strongly for the creation of scientific and/or stakeholder advisory committees to serve as a source of and improve ongoing public input and to assist government agencies with effective decision-making. Several people proposed the addition of an action about performing an analysis of and creating a detailed matrix describing what each agency does related to New England ocean planning and management based on existing regulatory and planning responsibilities and levels of funding. Potential Actions that drew particular favorable attention were: "Increase interagency coordination across management and regulatory programs" and "Conduct regional cumulative impacts analysis utilizing improved environmental and ocean use information and data." Commenters also suggested specific changes to the language of Goal 1.

Participants provided the following feedback about the goal "Health Ocean and Coastal Ecosystems": Commenters for clarity about how the Potential Actions would bring about the goal of protecting, restoring, and maintaining healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems. Some participants noted that identifying both local and regional science needs and priorities is of critical importance to effectively managing the ocean. Participants suggested that the methodology for identifying priority areas and science needs should be made public and that stakeholders should be invited to participate in the process and some commenters also suggested a number of priority regional science and research needs. Some commenters called for greater recognition of the impact of watershed and upland activities, including nonpoint source pollution, on the health and wellbeing of the ocean and indicated that the regional ocean planning process must address upland impacts aggressively. A large number of commenters applauded the specific inclusion of climate change in the document, expressed their concerns about climate change on ocean health, and suggested that more thought be put into how forecasting of climate change will be incorporated into ocean planning efforts and how climate change might impact the locations of marine and coastal wetland flora and fauna. Commenters also suggested specific changes to the language of Goal 2.

Participants provided the following feedback about the goal "Compatibility Among Past, Current, and Future Ocean Uses": Many commenters said that planning for future uses should be purposeful and grounded in a vision of how New England, as a society and as a region, sees its future and how it would like to define its future relationship with the ocean. Members of the public encouraged the RPB to clearly identify the tradeoffs that exist between different users and uses and recommended the creation of a transparent process, including information about where ultimate decision-making authority sits, for identifying and making decisions about these tradeoffs. A commenter suggested that it may be best for the RPB to focus on defining what types of alterations to the environment might be considered (or prohibited) rather than what types of activities/projects would be allowed. Some commenters urged the RPB to remember, in resolving conflict between competing uses, that many oceanfront communities are water-dependent, and requested that existing uses (such as fishing) be respected when decisions are made about the expansion of new uses in the oceans. Other people said it is important for all possible uses and users to be considered and suggested that decisions ought to think about future needs and benefits, not just past traditions and patterns of use. Responding to the Potential Outcome that seeks to create information for "preserving important cultural and historic sites and traditions," some participants suggested that the important cultural and historic sites and traditions of *all* ocean and waterfront communities must be recognized, not only those of Native American communities. Some participants noted that there are inevitable limitations to planning efforts to address compatibility issues between diverse uses and suggested that direct negotiations between users or ad hoc facilitated discussions may be more useful. Commenters also suggested specific changes to the language of Goal 3.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

Tasked with coordinating regional ocean planning efforts in New England, the Northeast Regional Planning Body (RPB) is one of nine regional planning bodies created by the National Ocean Policy, an executive order signed by President Obama in 2010. One of the Northeast RPB's first activities was to develop a set of draft goals for ocean planning in New England and then hold a series of public meetings throughout the region to solicit feedback on the draft goals. This report summarizes public comments and feedback received on the draft goals at these ten public meetings and comments submitted in writing, both electronically and in hard copy. The draft goals people gave feedback on are included in Appendix A.

PUBLIC MEETING PROCESS AND OVERVIEW

The Northeast RPB is committed to engaging with the public and soliciting public input about ocean planning in New England. A series of ten public meetings was designed to solicit input about the draft goals in an informal and conversational way, allowing members of the public to learn about initial regional ocean planning process and products, engage informally with RPB members and staff, and ask questions and provide feedback about the draft goals. The meetings were publicized through a variety of channels including listings in local newspapers, listservs of fishermen and other user groups, and a request to ocean leaders in New England to help spread the word. There were four meeting in Massachusetts, three in Maine, and one each in Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island. Participation varied between larger and smaller cities with generally between 15 and 50 people in attendance at each meeting. Further information about these meetings, including presentations, handouts, and other materials, as well as information about upcoming RPB meetings can be found on the website of the Northeast RPB: http://northeastoceancouncil.org/regional-planning-body/meetings/.

The Northeast Regional Planning Body will be reviewing this extensive feedback on their draft goals and revising their goals in the late summer and early fall of 2013. They will present revised goals and objectives at their fall 2013 meeting, tentatively scheduled for November.

MEETING SUMMARY OVERVIEW

The Consensus Building Institute (CBI) facilitated the public meetings on regional ocean planning described here. CBI is a nonprofit organization that empowers public, private, government and community stakeholders to resolve issues, reach better, more durable agreements and build stronger relationships. CBI staff wrote this summary of the public feedback on the draft goals received during the meetings and through written comment submissions. The summary is not intended to capture every statement made, but rather to distill the key feedback for RPB consideration from those who contributed their thoughts in person or in writing. This summary will inform the work of the RPB members and will be made available to the public.

PUBIC MEETING STRUCTURE

This section describes the general structure followed at the public meetings. For a sample meeting agenda, see Appendix B.

a. Meeting Introduction

Each meeting opened with comments by an RPB member from the host state introducing the meeting and providing context for the regional ocean planning effort and the process to solicit public input. The meetings in Massachusetts and Rhode Island were structured somewhat differently from the rest of the meetings; the first discussions in these meetings focused on Massachusetts and Rhode Island's ocean planning efforts. In Massachusetts, Bruce Carlisle reviewed the contents of the Massachusetts Ocean Management Plan, the scope for revising and updating the Plan, and feedback received from the Massachusetts Ocean Advisory Commission and the Massachusetts Science Advisory Council about the Plan. More information about the Massachusetts Ocean Management Plan can be found at: http://www.mass.gov/eea/ocean-coastal-management/mass-ocean-plan/. In Rhode Island, Grover Fugate and Jennifer McCann reviewed the Rhode Island Ocean Special Area Management Plan (SAMP), including its effect on issues such as the siting of offshore wind turbines and ongoing data collection and research efforts. More information about the Rhode Island Ocean SAMP can be found at: http://seagrant.gso.uri.edu/oceansamp/.

In each meeting, a federal RPB member, most often Betsy Nicholson of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) (but occasionally Daniel Hubbard of the US Coast Guard) described the concept of ocean planning, the policy context for regional ocean planning in New England, the organization of the Northeast RPB, and the framing principles the RPB has adopted to guide its work:

1. The ocean and its resources are managed for the benefit of the public, now and in the future.
2. The historic, cultural and spiritual importance of the ocean are important to consider.
3. The present and past connection between communities, watersheds and ocean is important.
4. New ocean uses are emerging and existing ocean uses are changing.
5. There is concern about changing ocean "health" and ecosystem conditions.
6. Better data and information, including traditional knowledge, will lead to better understanding and decision-making.
7. There is a need for improved government efficiencies and transparency.
8. We need to adapt as environmental, social and economic conditions change.
9. Importantly, regional ocean planning outcomes must be implemented through existing authorities and regulations. Neither the National Ocean Policy nor regional ocean planning create or change existing authorities.

The RPB member noted that the ocean is a busy place with demands from many users; demands are increasing (new and expanded human activities) which, combined with changing environmental conditions, result in a need to plan for future ocean use. Another impetus for engaging in ocean planning is the existence of more than 140 laws governing oceans and coastal management and the many government agencies whose work impacts the oceans. Ocean

planning can serve as a catalyst for creating more and better information about the oceans and for enhanced coordination and decision making among government agencies and ocean users.

This opening presentation also addressed the following key aspects of the regional ocean planning effort. First, the National Ocean Policy, under which regional planning bodies operate, does not provide the regional RPBs or any other body with authority to zone or regulate ocean uses. Instead, regional planning bodies (composed in the northeast of representatives from the New England States, ten federal agencies, ten federally recognized Native American tribes, and the New England Fishery Management Council), are mandated to meet, plan, and coordinate activities using their current authority. Second, the RPB is intended to build upon existing efforts, not to duplicate work already underway at the state level.

b. Data and Information

After the broad introduction to regional ocean planning and any state-specific presentations, Northeast Regional Ocean Council (NROC) staff members John Weber or Nick Napoli presented current efforts to gather information on ocean uses and natural resources in the New England region. This work includes engaging specific constituencies to better understand and map the footprint of maritime commerce, energy, aquaculture, vessel traffic, recreational boating, commercial fishing, and other related human activities, as well as efforts to compile existing natural resource (habitat and species) data. As part of this work, NROC has sought and continues to seek information and feedback on draft maps from various user groups and industries to further refine and ensure the accuracy of these products. Furthermore, additional work is planned to address subjects such as cultural and historic resources, recreational fishing, security and military uses, and some types of commercial fishing. Much of this information, maps, and technological capability is available on the Northeast Ocean Data Portal: www.northeastoceandata.org. At each meeting, participants were given approximately thirty minutes to review representative maps in an informal manner and to provide feedback and ask questions of NROC staff and RPB members related to what they saw. Participants offered brief suggestions and comments in writing on the maps, which can be found in Appendix C.

c. Regional Ocean Planning Goals

The final and longest segment of each meeting was devoted to a discussion of the draft regional ocean planning goals developed by the Northeast RPB. The federal lead who presented the introduction gave an overview of each goal, then participants were asked to share their feedback on (1) which aspects of the goals they like or would they change and why, (2) of the example actions and outcomes under each goal, which did they think should be the priorities or what other suggestions did they have, and (3) which activities are especially appropriate to undertake at this multi-state, regional scale? Section II of this summary captures broad themes and feedback offered across goals, while feedback, comments, and answers to these three specific questions are grouped in sections III-V.

II. General Comments on Goals and Regional Ocean Planning

This section captures the comments participants made that do not pertain specifically to one of the goals. Some of the comments are about the regional planning process as a whole, some are focused on public participation and outreach, and some are focused on data and information. Specific comments about the three draft goals are reported in sections III-V.

a. Scope and Phasing of Ocean Planning Process

Many participants expressed support for the RPB's mission and efforts to engage in regional ocean planning for the Northeast. Commenters expressed support for the effort to take a deliberate, purposeful approach to planning for the future needs and uses of New England's ocean. In addition, many participants expressed support for the effort to bring together federal government agencies, state government agencies, and tribal nations to improve communication and work together for enhanced ocean management.

Some commenters expressed concern that the overall approach of spatial planning would segment and partition the ocean as "a commons." In particular, they voiced concern about corporate use and control of parts of the ocean and its resources. Some also noted that biological resources, such as fish stocks, do not stay in fixed locations but rather move within the ocean, and expressed concern that there might be some effort to "section off" parts of the ocean for singular uses.

A commenter critiqued the RPB's approval of a charter and creation of draft goals without first conducting a capacity assessment and determining the geographic scope (e.g. the inclusion of estuaries and other features at the land-ocean boundary) of the planning area. The commenter suggested that, before the RPB moves further, it should determine how the regional planning process will be integrated with existing state, regional, sub-regional and local planning processes (e.g. NROC, Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment), and agency strategic plans. In order to help the RPB identify impediments it is likely to face as it pursues its coordination work (such as legal constraints on the inclusion of certain data sets or on information sharing between agencies), a commenter suggested that the RPB evaluate why existing processes (such as environmental assessments, environmental impact statements, regulatory impact analyses, fiscal impact statements, etc.) do not follow a coordinated planning approach (as the RPB is proposing to do).

A participant suggested that the following steps be considered in conducting an in-depth review of the nature and scope of the problems that the RPB is trying to address from a regional perspective:

- Identify regionally specific concerns and issues;
- Explore what changes need to be made to relevant legislative and regulatory requirements and programs that do not use an ecosystem based management approach in order to transition them to an ecosystem based management approach;

- Evaluate relevant legislative and regulatory requirements and programs that do employ an ecosystem based management approach;
- Determine how information about coastal/ocean activities that are not regulated can be collected and considered in the context of decisions and/or policies regarding other ocean-related and coastal activities;
- Identify what mechanisms exist for management of anticipated future ocean uses, including any gaps or deficiencies;
- Evaluate mechanisms for inter-regional communication and coordination about programs/projects on coastal or ocean related activities/uses (e.g. does NROC provide functionality for this type of communication and coordination and if so, how can such communication and coordination be enhanced). Examine when, where, how, and what inter-regional communications/coordination should occur.
- Identify what, how, and when data, expertise, and resources within the general public, the academic community, governmental, nongovernmental, and tribal entities can or should be accessed and leveraged to promote the mission of the NE-RPB.

A commenter suggested that the RPB revisit its mission and place it within an overarching contextual framework that more specifically identifies the core function of the RPB. The commenter suggested the following framework for the RPB's mission: "develop a more integrated, comprehensive, ecosystem-based, flexible and proactive approach to planning and managing sustainable multiple uses across sectors and improving our stewardship of the ocean and coastal ecosystems."

b. The Framing Principles

Most members of the public did not comment on the framing principles of the Draft Goals document. Only one or two comments were received about these principles, which are summarized below.

A commenter suggested the incorporation of these additional framing principles:

- The ocean's natural resources provide healthy food for the peoples of the world.
- The ocean's natural resources may provide lessons as well as other organisms that benefit the human population in other ways.
- Much of the ocean is unexplored and offers opportunities for scientific exploration, research, and discovery.
- Coastal communities have historic patterns of access to the ocean based on their geography and development.
- There is concern about changing ocean "health" and ecosystem conditions.
- The northeast fishery is one of the most highly regulated fisheries in the world. There is recognition that ecosystem management rather than solely single species management may more effectively protect the biological resource while providing flexibility and access to the fishing sectors.

A member of the public urged the RPB to focus on the ninth framing principle in the Draft Goals document ("Importantly, regional ocean planning outcomes must be implemented through existing authorities and regulations. Neither the National Ocean Policy nor regional ocean planning create or change existing authorities") and questioned whether the RPB has authority to do anything more than synthesize existing information and identify information gaps.

c. The Three Draft Goals

Meeting participants and people who submitted written comments were generally positive about the nature and general focus of the draft goals. Commenters indicated that the goals cover the three most important areas that are critical to consider with regard to regional ocean planning. In addition, some participants proposed that the RPB create succinct mission and vision statements to better explain its purpose to the public. Some participants also stated that having three distinct goals without an overarching framework within which those goals relate to one another suggests the development of three separate planning frameworks (when there should be one, comprehensive planning framework).

d. Goal Structure

Commenters generally expressed appreciation for the *Goal – Action – Outcome* structure of the Draft Goals. People indicated that this tiered approach provides both a big-picture sense of the intention and focus of the goal while indicating how it would be actualized. Individual commenters offered differing comments about which of the three goals is more important than the others, but there was not consensus or broad agreement about this across commenters.

e. Measurable Outcomes

Many commenters called for greater clarity about causality – that is, how the Actions and Outcomes proposed under each of the three goals would help to bring about the goal itself. One participant stated that institutional changes can occur much more quickly than changes in human welfare and ecosystem conditions and that, as such, it is important for the RPB to articulate clearly what they expect to result from actions at two-, five-, and ten-year timeframes. Some commenters recommended that there be more specificity about the challenges that each action is trying to address (such as the effects of climate change, ocean acidification, etc.) and also that measureable objectives and specific outcomes be tied to each goal so it is possible to evaluate progress in achieving the goals. Specific metrics were suggested for Goal 1 (permitting time, the number of administrative appeals, and the number of lawsuits filed).

f. Planning at a Regional Scale

A number of commenters articulated the challenge of thinking regionally about the ocean and ocean planning. They noted that certain issues are best addressed at the regional level, others at the local level. Other people indicated that their primary concerns are related to local issues and any impacts of regional ocean planning on their local communities, emphasizing the importance of relating regional planning efforts back to local concerns. Some members of the public expressed apprehension about federally-led planning in terms of the long-term impact of the planning and the difficulty of influencing decisions made at the federal level. A commenter

requested sub-regional flexibility within decision-making processes as stakeholder groups will be different in different places.

While many commenters emphasized the virtues of local control, some commenters also highlighted the benefits of a regional approach. For example, the ocean does not operate according to local jurisdictions or political boundaries, and some challenges facing ocean users and the ocean ecosystem are best addressed at a regional approach scale. These regionally-scaled issues include studying the effects of climate change and responding to these changes through adaptation efforts, ocean acidification, and identifying science and research needs to fill key gaps in knowledge. A participant suggested that the RPB clearly identify and leverage links between state ocean plans, regional ocean plans, and national goals as a way to achieve desired outcomes. Some commenters said that planning at the regional level should take priority over state-led planning and that the state-level efforts in Massachusetts and Rhode Island should be incorporated into the regional effort.

g. RPB Membership

Some people commented on the membership of the RPB, which was mandated by the National Ocean Policy. In particular, some suggested that academic and research institutions should be included in the RPB. Others stated that the New England Fisheries Management Council does not adequately represent commercial fishing interests. Members of the public emphasized the importance and value of the federal RPB members attending the public meetings, as they did,to personally hear public input and perspectives. A participant requested that Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) personnel attend the public meetings to hear from the public.

h. Creativity and Action

Many commenters encouraged the RPB to be bold in its work. While recognizing that the National Ocean Policy does not create new federal policies or regulations, participants encouraged boldness and creativity in using regional planning efforts to resolve issues presented by multiple uses and the changes precipitated by climate change, for example. Some commenters expressed concern that the goals themselves are not bold enough and that enhanced regulatory authority might be needed to carry out effective ocean planning.

i. Setting Priorities

Some commenters also expressed concerns that the draft goals are overly broad and suggested that specific ideas and initiatives within the goals be prioritized. They said the RPB should be reasonable in anticipating what can be achieved within resource and time constraints and suggested that the RPB build a framework for agencies to identify and work on the most important issues.

j. A Robust and Scientifically-Driven Process

Commenters called for a robust ocean planning process that is not “softened” to accommodate political considerations or for the sake of the public. Specifically, a commenter suggested that the National Ocean Policy seemed to have been softened to make it politically palatable. The

commenter emphasized the importance of engaging in a robust planning process now in order to minimize conflicts in the future. For example, if "ecosystem based management" and "coastal marine spatial planning" are the accurate terms to use, then these should be used in discussions and public meetings.

k. Data and Information

Many commenters supported the collection and use of regional ocean data, such as that being collected by NROC, to better inform regional planning efforts. Commenters noted that, in many areas, data does not currently exist at a regional level and that collecting such data would be a very valuable service provided by the regional ocean planning process.

Many people emphasized that the temporal and spatial scales of data used to make decisions should be appropriate to the context. For example, sometimes agencies or consultants use outdated data or data that only shows a snap-shot of conditions at a particular time, either of which could be inappropriate for regional ocean planning, particularly in the context of dynamic and changing ocean conditions and uses. Commenters suggested that using historic data to make future projections may be ill-advised. A participant also noted that surveys performed in the same location, at the same time of year, every year are increasingly out of date and do not track ongoing changes in the ocean. Similar concerns were raised about the spatial scale of data used to guide planning or project efforts, with the area of evaluation needing to be appropriately sized to accurately evaluate the impact on metrics such as ecosystem wellbeing.

To address these concerns about outdated and inappropriate temporal and spatial data, commenters suggested that data be as up-to-date as possible and be collected continually to properly inform ongoing decision-making. Some commenters emphasized the need for adaptive management and quality assurance / quality control efforts to ensure that appropriate and accurate data are used to guide decision-making. Data should take account of ongoing changes, including climate change, ocean acidification, and the transient nature of marine species and habitats. A participant noted that the RPB should use the wealth of good data available in New England's oceanographic institutes. Several people also recommended execution of an ethnographic study to provide richer information about ocean uses and users beyond the maps currently being prepared by NROC.

Several people suggested that, in addition to biological, oceanographic, and other types of "hard" data, social science be an integral part of the data and methodology for regional ocean planning since social science tells us much of what scientists, decision-makers, and society knows about effective decision-making, human uses of the ocean, how different uses interact and how humans negotiate these interactions and resolve conflicts.

Many participants provided feedback about the NROC maps displayed at the public meetings. A summary of those comments is provided in Appendix D, and general themes from the comments about maps are provided here. A member of the public suggested it would be useful to provide a location where agency data sets are aggregated and publicly accessible for the

public to manipulate, create maps, and provide feedback. Commenters identified data that is missing or inaccurate on the maps (such as cable rights of way, the actual locations of cables, sites where catch is sorted, and the locations of fishing communities) and also maps that should be created (such as lobstering, pollution, birds, ocean currents, non-motorized boating, maps of ocean features that are important to humans (such as rock outcroppings), maps showing per-day and per-season uses, and animated maps). A member of the public suggested fishermen were to be asked about where fishing currently takes place, where they want to fish in the future, and about the areas that need to be protected, their input would produce very different maps than are produced using current fishing data. One participant recommended creating maps that incorporate economic and fishing data to illustrate where fishing is generating substantial income. This type of map could be done seasonally, and with historic data to show changes in economically productive zones. In contrast, another participant countered that assigning an economic value to a specific area is not effective given that small changes in agency decisions can cause coastal towns to either thrive or decline.

Some commenters stressed the importance of map users understanding the map data sources, the time periods of the data sources, and the limitations of both those data sources and the spatial representation of information that is inherent to mapping. Someone expressed concern that this data collection process seemed to be placing a premature emphasis on mapping since existing laws, regulations, policies, and resources determine whether the information presented in the maps can even be considered as part of the planning process. Finally, some participants suggested that some sort of policy or procedure be created to ensure that the intended user groups actually use the data created by the regional planning process.

l. Adaptive Management

Related to the need to have accurate, timely data, commenters suggested that the principles of adaptive management be incorporated much more centrally in the draft goals such that the effectiveness of activities associated with the goals can inform ongoing implementation. In particular, commenters emphasized the importance of adaptive management in the context of the changing nature of the ocean environments (such as fluctuations in ocean temperatures) as well as evolving societal and economic needs.

m. Lessons from Elsewhere

Commenters suggested that the RPB look to state ocean plans, such as those in Massachusetts and Rhode Island, and other related efforts for lessons learned and potential frameworks for organizing this northeast ocean planning process. One commenter suggested that the RPB study the processes used by state agencies that have been involved in reviewing and permitting offshore projects. For example, in Massachusetts, the Army Corps of Engineers hosts monthly meetings with regulators to discuss specific projects and larger issues, and developers can request an appointment to present and discuss specific project issues at these meetings. A participant suggested that the RPB could learn from BOEM's experience convening regulatory and resource agencies to assist in identifying areas suitable and unsuitable for offshore wind development.

n. Implementation and Follow Through

Commenters at many meetings asked who would be responsible for making sure the regional ocean plan goes into effect and is implemented, expressing concern that it might not become operational without new legislation or enhanced regulatory authority. Some urged the RPB to remain within its non-regulatory boundaries and focus on serving as a forum to improve the quality and accessibility of information rather than developing any sort of regional plan or planning framework that might inadvertently lead to increased regulatory inefficiency. Someone noted that the government does many things beyond regulation (funds and conducts research, provides technical assistance, builds things, and is itself a user of the ocean) so simply improving coordination between government agencies and entities and focusing the government's awareness on New England's ocean priorities could bring significant benefits to the region.

One commenter proposed organizing the RPB similar to the regional dredge team model established by a cooperative agreement between New York, Connecticut, and the Army Corps of Engineers. Under this model, the regional dredge team reviews and comments on proposed dredge material disposal plans before disposal begins. Another participant, building on a similar notion, recommended the RPB model an interagency review group like those formed in Massachusetts, possibly in collaboration with NROC, to serve as a forum for interagency pre-application coordination to improve the project and permitting review process.

Some participants suggested the need for mechanisms that require government agencies to use the data collected by NROC so that the data collected as part of the regional planning process informs the government's work.

o. Public Participation

People generally had constructive and positive things to say about both the format and structure of this series of public meetings. Workshop participants expressed appreciation for the conversational and informal tone of the meetings that allowed for up-close viewing of the maps, informal discussion with staff and RPB members and other participants, and comment and question periods that were not overly formalized or strictly regulated in terms of the time allocated for each commenter.[1]

Members of the public emphasized the importance of incorporating public input into the planning process and noted that people tend to stop participating if they sense that their input is not taken seriously. Some expressed a sense that language in the proposed goals about "informing and engaging the public" seems patronizing; one commenter suggested adding the verb "participate" as a stronger indication of a desire to involve stakeholders meaningfully in the regional ocean planning process. Some suggested creating stakeholder or technical advisory

[1] In meetings with high attendance, participants had a more limited time to talk than at those with a smaller number of participants.

bodies as other avenues to participation. Some noted that "the public" consists of many different constituencies and that effective outreach efforts should be targeted to each of these. Many participants also asked about the future of the regional ocean planning process and about opportunities for ongoing and enhanced public involvement in coming years.

A participant emphasized the importance of bringing all stakeholders to the table when trying to create compatibility between different uses and, more broadly, during the entire ocean planning process. The Island Institute, for example, makes sure that actual fishermen attend meetings in addition to representatives of different fishing industries because the fishermen understand their own needs and interests and can effectively negotiate tradeoffs with other ocean users. Some participants also advocated for the incorporation of mechanisms to involve the public in decision-making around specific projects.

Some participants critiqued the handling of public participation during the regional planning process more broadly. A commenter requested that the RPB to do a better job of sharing information with the public about the content of written comments submitted before and after RPB meetings. In addition, a commenter expressed concern that public comments received about the draft goals would be summarized, due to the subjectivity of the summarization process, and recommended that the meetings instead be recorded.

Participants also suggested that greater effort be made to leverage existing knowledge and encourage public efforts to generate information. For example, a participant suggested that government agencies could partner with teachers and schools to create projects and contests in which students (of various ages) could collect and display information about the ocean and ocean communities.

Members of the public mentioned the following projects as examples of good collaborative practice with the public: the Statoil project in Maine; the tidal project in Eastport, Maine; the siting of offshore wind turbines in Maine; and the Massachusetts Ocean Fisheries Partnership. A participant recommended the approach taken by the National Harbor Island Park Service project in which an unlimited number of *ex officio* members could be added who were then kept abreast of progress and developments.

p. Outreach to User Groups

Some commenters emphasized the need to perform additional outreach to better inform members of the public and members from specific ocean user groups about the meetings and about regional ocean planning in general. In particular, comments received in many of the meetings emphasized that fisherman were not well represented at the meetings and that public outreach efforts should actively solicit participation from this group. People said public participation was likely to increase once the planning process has progressed and draft results have been produced. Other key groups mentioned for further outreach include: municipal officials, oceanographers, academics, tugboat pilots, energy industry representatives, seafood consumers, the tourism and hospitality industry, recreational users (including motorized

boating, recreational fishing, and a variety of non-consumptive recreational uses such as surfing, swimming, kayaking, diving, wildlife appreciation and beach users), coastal landowners, and ports and shipping industry representatives.

Commenters suggested the following public outreach strategies: have local journalists write feature articles in local newspapers before public meetings; conduct outreach to energy, shipping, and other industry groups; hold public meetings and outreach efforts in locations that are convenient for target participants; piggyback on existing outreach/adult education events; use webinars, social media, and other technology to reach a wider (and younger) audience; and leverage the contacts of each RPB member. Other suggestions for RPB meetings included the creation of a public comment form on the RPB website that takes comments throughout the ocean planning process; explaining how written comments can be submitted; and providing ample notice before public meetings and posting relevant materials well in advance of meetings.

Participants suggested that, until members of the public clearly understand what is at stake and what the direct impacts on them will be of the ocean planning effort, they are unlikely to participate in public meetings of this sort. It is the job of the RPB to communicate about the process in ways that are understandable, relevant, and personally important to a variety of people. People cited the following as examples of effective framing and communication: the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority's contingency plan for the ocean outfall in Massachusetts Bay and the Canadian Department of Fisheries & Ocean's Eastern Scotian Shelf Integrated Management (ESSIM) Plan cooperative learning development model.

q. Geographically-Specific Comments

Members of the public made some comments that were geographically or contextually specific to the locations of particular meetings. These comments are summarized here:

- Mainers expressed concern about preservation of rural, isolated fishing communities and the centrality of the ocean to the livelihood and wellbeing of these communities.
- Participants in Rockland, Maine, expressed concerns about the planned dredging of West Penobscot Bay and Rockland Harbor and the impact this dredging could have on the local lobster population, local eco-tourism, and real estate.
- Meeting participants in New Haven, Connecticut discussed the need for a spatial planning process in Long Island Sound because the Sound crosses two ocean councils, two states, and coordination of local efforts with the regional planning processes done by the councils and states will be critical for long term management of the ocean and the Sound. Meeting participants requested the RPB acknowledge and address the differences in aquaculture as culturally and historically practiced in Long Island Sound compared to the newly developing aquaculture practices throughout the region. Some expressed concern that without sufficient interagency coordination, regional planning decisions might negatively impact local, historical aquaculture beds.
- A commenter requested that the Northeast RPB work with the Mid-Atlantic RPB to clarify their respective jurisdictions over Long Island Sound, perhaps in the form of a

formal MOU between the regions. In addition, the commenter requested that the Northeast RPB provide direct logistical and financial support to assure the success of the bi-state ocean planning effort taking place for Long Island Sound.

III. Feedback on Goal 1: Effective Decision Making

The Northeast Regional Planning Body provides the following overview of Goal 1, Effective Decision Making: "Improve management effectiveness, intergovernmental decision-making, engagement, collaboration, and integration of best available knowledge. Reflect ever-changing social, environmental and technological conditions." This section describes the themes of comments received at the public meetings and in written comments in response to Goal 1, as drafted. Please see Appendix A for the full text of the Draft Goals.

a. General feedback

Many said that improving decision making is essential and is one of the major opportunities provided by the formation of the Regional Planning Body. Some commenters said the goal of effective decision-making should be in service of the other two goals of promoting healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems and encouraging compatibility among past, current, and future ocean uses. In other words, they see this goal as a means to accomplish the other two, more fundamental (in their view) goals. Others suggested that Goal 1 needs to be more specific.

Regarding Potential Outcome 1 (improved decision-making time), some suggested that the focus of effective decision-making should be on making wise, not quick, decisions. Furthermore, wise decision-making needs to include monitoring for ongoing adaptive management. Others supported the emphasis on efficiency and suggested that business and industry would be in favor of reduced permitting times.

Many participants wanted greater clarity about which agency would have final decision making authority in the ocean planning process and any resulting ongoing planning processes. Some asked who will define the concept of "effective decision making." Another member of the public inquired how much decision-making authority each of nine ocean planning regions around the country would actually be given versus central control from Washington, DC.

One member of the public provided an example of enhanced coordination leading to effective decision making. The commenter discussed the collaborative process recently undertaken between federal and state government agencies and stakeholder groups to revise policies of the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement for evaluating proposals to convert obsolete, offshore oil and natural gas production platforms into artificial reefs. Working through the National Ocean Council, the numerous federal and state agencies and stakeholder groups met to discuss and identify policy changes that would allow the states the greatest flexibility in their artificial reef planning while balancing environmental considerations with the other uses for the structures and reef areas. The mutually-beneficial solution was made possible by the opportunity provided through the National Ocean Council to bring these previously non-communicating groups together.

Some people raised questions about how the regional ocean planning process fits into the broader policy-making process and, in particular, about the difference between "planning" and "decision-making." Some expressed doubts about the efficacy of the planning process,

particularly as the RPB is operating within existing boundaries of authority and has not been given additional authority to take action to implement its planning efforts. Some commenters emphasized the centrality of regulation to government action and effectiveness. Some participants asked about how the results of regional ocean planning efforts will be coordinated with site-specific National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review processes. A number of participants inquired about the RPB's relationship to existing bodies, particularly the New England Fishery Management Council, and expressed concerns about the Council's ability to represent fishermen. Some commenters advocated for allowing existing fisheries management to continue with its work without adding additional bureaucracy.

b. Engagement with Local Jurisdictions and Municipal Officials

Commenters emphasized the importance of engaging with local jurisdictions and their elected officials, both in ongoing decision-making and in the development of the regional planning effort. Participants said that because local governments will be critical for implementation of a regional plan, regional ocean planning should include both (a) clearly defined municipal roles and responsibilities, and (b) early engagement of municipal representatives.

c. Engagement with Citizens and Scientific Institutions

Some commenters advocated strongly for the creation of scientific and/or stakeholder advisory committees to serve as a source of and improve ongoing public input and to assist government agencies with effective decision-making. Some recommended using existing state ocean advisory committees, though not all states have such committees. Conversely, some commenters said that regional ocean planning advisory committees should be truly regional and should not rely on the existing or newly formed state-level stakeholder bodies such as those in Massachusetts and Rhode Island because state-focused committees will not have regional interests as their key focus. Commenters also suggested that the RPB take advantage of the data, knowledge, and expertise already present in the New England regions' many oceanographic institutes and advocacy organizations such as the Island Institute.

d. Intergovernmental Decision-Making and Coordination

Several participants said Potential Action 2 ("increase interagency coordination across management and regulatory programs") is the most important action of Goal One, and also extremely important for achieving the other two goals. One participant asked if broad interagency coordination will be the outcome or whether specific issues will drive coordination at specific times. Another suggested that interagency coordination should be considered an outcome and not an action. Another member of the public urged the RPB to identify early on which specific regulatory processes are appropriate to address through regional ocean planning and to create guidelines and a structure to ensure that the process will in fact improve government efficiency and not add another layer of bureaucracy. Other commenters urged the RPB to consider how they could improve the current roles of federal, state, and local governments in existing decision-making processes.

e. Clarifying Authority and Jurisdictions

Several people proposed the addition of an action about performing an analysis of and creating a detailed matrix describing what each agency does related to New England ocean planning and management based on existing regulatory and planning responsibilities and levels of funding. Such a matrix would be one way to identify what each agency brings to the table, thereby identifying redundancies and gaps. A map or diagram illustrating agency jurisdictions and network analysis of inter-agency and inter-governmental relationships and responsibilities could help explain the division of responsibilities between agencies and identify key areas where decision-making could be better coordinated among agencies.

f. Cumulative Impacts Analysis

Some meeting participants focused on Potential Action 5 ("Conduct regional cumulative impacts analysis utilizing improved environmental and ocean use information and data"). Several identified this action as a top priority. Participants inquired about what the baseline for the analysis would be, and one person suggested that the baseline should not be recent history but rather data about human activities and uses in the past few decades. Other participants asked whether the cumulative impact analysis could or would include analysis of onshore impacts caused by offshore activities and offshore activities impacted by those onshore. Some participants recommended that any regional cumulative impacts analysis should be undertaken in coordination with regional academic and research institutions. Some asked how this cumulative impact analysis would be performed, raising questions about whether it can actually be performed rigorously and effectively, and noting that laying map layers on top of one another does not constitute robust cumulative impact analysis.

g. Suggested Revisions to the Language of Goal 1

Members of the public suggested the following specific changes to the language of Goal 1:

- The title of the goal, Effective Decision Making, could be expanded to include improved communication and coordination, as gaps in communication and coordination seem to cause many difficulties between governmental agencies.
    - "Effective" could be substituted with "Coordinated"
- Be more specific about the meaning of the word "reflect" in the following sentence: "Reflect ever changing social, environmental, and technological conditions." A proposed revision is: "Incorporate changing social, environmental, and technological conditions into decision processes."
- The Potential Outcomes should include:
    - Ensuring stakeholder engagement, which could be executed by the creation of scientific and stakeholder advisory committees.
    - "Act to assure that control of ocean resources is not in the hands of the few but remains truly available to the larger society." This new Outcome would necessitate the dropping of Potential Outcome 2 ("Reduce appeals and conflicts during permitting"). While appeals and conflicts can indeed slow valuable

processes, appeals and conflicts that get resolved have to remain part of the process to assure wide participation.
    - A coordinated permitting process that employs an "ecosystem" approach to permitting.
    - A central notification system for agency, stakeholder, and public involvement.
    - Mediated meetings on particular areas of concern to inform permitting authorities.
    - Complexities of timing and mitigation resolved by inter-agency and public mediation rather than by siloed agency concerns.
- The Potential Actions should include:
    - Develop coordinated permitting timeframes for various types of projects.
    - Develop the data support for coordinated agency actions.
    - Track permitting timeframes and costs for projects.
    - Provide mediation, mapping, and scientific and traditional knowledge support for complex issues.
    - Conduct studies to suggest ways to maximize public benefits by integrating objectives.
    - Identification of data gaps.
    - Language about “communication of knowledge.”
    - Language about “incorporation of a historical perspective to inform decision-making such that cumulative impact analysis takes long-term and future trends into account.”
    - Language about “identifying efficiencies or inefficiencies in current processes.”
- Add the phrase “where appropriate” at the end of the Potential Action #2: “Increase interagency coordination across management and regulatory programs” to reflect the fact that the RPB will try to improve coordination around specific management and regulatory programs, not all of them.

IV. Feedback on Goal 2: Healthy Ocean and Coastal Ecosystems

The Northeast Regional Planning Body provides the following overview of Goal 2, Healthy Ocean and Coastal Ecosystems: "Develop a planning framework to protect, restore, and maintain healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems that provide social, cultural, spiritual, and economic benefits. Account for changing environmental conditions and new information as it becomes available. Respect the intrinsic value of the ocean, its biodiversity, and act as its steward/caretaker, recognizing humans as part of the ecosystem." This section describes the themes of comments received at the public meetings and in written comments in response to Goal 2, as drafted. Please see Appendix A for the full text of the Draft Goals.

a. General Comments

Some members of the public identified Goal 2 as the most important of the three goals. As with the other goals, participants suggested that the RPB develop metrics to measure the outcomes of Goal 2. Commenters asked how the Potential Actions would bring about the goal of protecting, restoring, and maintaining healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems. They asked for clarity about the relationship between Potential Actions such as mapping, identification of areas of regional importance, prioritizing research needs and the ultimate aims of Goal 2. Some people suggested that current and future threats to healthy ecosystems should be clearly identified by the RPB and said that maintaining the status quo will not lead to protection and maintenance of current uses. A commenter urged the RPB to define what specifically is meant by the term "planning framework" to make it clear what form the framework would take and what its implications would be from a management and regulatory standpoint. A participant applauded the inclusion of language about the spiritual importance of the ocean.

b. Priority Regional Science and Research Needs

Commenting on Potential Outcome 4 ("Priority list of regional science and research needs with an action plan to address priorities"), some participants noted that identifying both local and regional science needs and priorities is of critical importance to effectively managing the ocean. Participants suggested that the methodology for identifying priority areas and science needs should be made public and that stakeholders should be invited to participate in the process. They also said it is important to clearly define the terms being used and the intent of the exercise at the very beginning of the identification process. One participant proposed that a panel of scientists be established to develop a science-based methodology for identifying important ecological areas and noted that similar work was done in Massachusetts and Rhode Island during their respective planning processes.

Some participants questioned whether scientists and agencies currently have access to sufficient data and understand ocean ecology well enough to successfully identify priority needs.

Participants suggested the following priority regional science and research needs:

- Protection of ecosystem services to help the region adapt to climate change;
- Geographic areas

    - for passive (non-human uses) such as habitat conservation
    - containing rare marine resources;
    - of high productivity and biological diversity;
    - with spawning, breeding, and feeding;
    - and key species that are critical to ecosystem function and resiliency;
    - of regional importance;
    - of rare or functionally vulnerable marine resources;
    - and species important for human and ecosystem sustenance
- Migratory corridors;
- Understanding the potential effects of climate change on species and habitats in the New England region of the ocean.

A member of the public suggested that priority geographic areas be documented and mapped. People suggested that it is essential to identify opportunities within existing regulations and authorities for restoration and protection.

c. Land-Side Impact on the Ocean

Some commenters called for greater recognition of the impact of watershed and upland activities, including nonpoint source pollution, on the health and wellbeing of the ocean. Some members of the public said that upland activity has a significant impact on ocean health and that the regional ocean planning process must address this issue aggressively in order for it to have credibility among certain constituencies such as the fishing and environmental communities. Members of the public emphasized the connection between ocean resources and key coastal resources such as estuaries, coastal salt marshes and migratory fish runs and spawning habitat. One member of the public called for greater public education about the impact of watershed health on ocean health.

d. Climate Change

A number of commenters applauded the specific inclusion of climate change in the following potential action: “Model future environmental conditions, such as potential climate change effects on species’ habitat, distribution, and/or abundance.” A participant noted that the phrase “climate change” is mentioned only once in the Goals document and that climate change is a concept that has significant implications for many aspects of the Goals. Many commenters expressed their concern about climate change and its impact on the oceans and advocated for climate change to be a more central consideration in the regional planning process.

Many commenters suggested that more thought be put into how forecasting of climate change will be incorporated into ocean planning efforts and how climate change might impact the locations of marine and coastal wetland flora and fauna. A commenter suggested that the changes driven by climate require that dynamic, rather than steady state, modeling, monitoring, and science approaches for both adaptive, ecosystem based management and for coastal and marine spatial planning be used.

e. Working within Regulatory Boundaries

Some participants urged the RPB to move carefully in its efforts to promote healthy ecosystems and to remain cognizant of the regulatory and other powers retained by existing agencies. One commenter recommended that the RPB deliberate and decide upon which specific policies and processes among the numerous federal and state laws focused on conservation and restoration of species and habitats are in need of improved interagency coordination prior to establishing this and similar goals and actions. Someone reminded RPB members that the National Ocean Policy Implementation Plan says, "commercial and recreational fishing will continue to be managed exclusively by the relevant State and Federal fisheries managers and Regional Fishery Management Councils or Commissions." The commenter urged the RPB to be clear that it does not seeking regulatory changes that may result in the prohibition of public access to fisheries.

f. Suggested Revisions to the Language of Goal 2

Members of the public suggested the following specific changes to the language of Goal 2:

- The word "healthy" to describe the ocean is vague.
- Revise the goal statement to bring in the concept of ecosystem-based management: "Develop a planning framework for ecosystem-based management. Protect, restore and maintain healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems. Promote new and existing sustainable uses of ocean resources and the integration of public benefits across uses. Account for changing environmental conditions and new information as it becomes available."
- Within the goal statement, replace the word "protect" with "conserve." For many, these two words are used interchangeably, but functionally they represent substantially divergent views of resource management. "Protect" signifies a desire to prohibit human interaction with a resource, whereas "conserve" indicates a desire to manage for wise and sustainable use of the resource for the benefit and enjoyment of the public.
- Remove the phrase "and act as its steward/caretaker" from the goal description. This is a highly subjective phrase that implies that the Regional Planning Body holds or assumes management authority over the ocean and its resources.
- Include language about water quality in Goal 2.
- Include the following Potential Outcomes:
    - Reliable, predictable fisheries exist within a sustainable healthy ecosystem. Regulators have greater capacity to integrate natural fluctuations of species' abundance into reliable measurements of ocean health and diversity. People of the Northeast region have access to exceptionally healthy, local, wild-caught fish.
    - Biological health and diversity of the ocean improves.
    - Additional natural resources are identified and used in sustainable ways.
    - Greater diversity of uses exists without conflict.
    - Coastal communities provide portals to greater knowledge and wealth from the ocean while providing stewardship and leadership for global ocean health.
    - Language about the importance of maintaining and/or restoring estuaries.

    - Avoidance of negative effects to the ocean and coastal ecosystem from existing uses and new development, or minimizing negative impacts to the greatest extent possible.
- Include the following Potential Actions:
    - Public education.
    - Some action that would lead specifically toward the Potential Outcome of "Greater recognition and understanding of the connection between riverine water quality and healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems."
    - Explore ways to integrate the data being collected daily from the ocean observing systems and by other means into permitting to allow real-time predictive ability and early adjustments.
    - Develop public understanding of interactions between the waters that are regulated and those outside US jurisdiction.
    - Study potential economic returns of ocean uses. Identify developing maritime markets, remembering that fisheries management happens through the New England Fisheries Management Council.
    - Perform a regional assessment to identify market and non-market values of a healthy ocean and coastal ecosystem. This would incorporate the value of consumer surplus – that is, the value one *would* pay beyond the known costs to access a free resource, such as the ocean, waves or beaches.
    - Move the following Potential Action, currently under Goal 1, to Goal 2: "Conduct regional cumulative impacts analysis utilizing improved environmental and ocean use information and data."

- Review and consider the ecological benefits and impacts of different uses.
- Many people suggested including language about habitat and other types of restoration into Goal 2 (and one participant expressed caution that the word "restore" connotes a well-defined baseline to which a resource should return, which may not be possible given impacts from climate change).
- Include language about water quality in Goal 2.
- Name specific, important habitats to be mapped such as spawning habitat, bottom breeding habitat, migration corridors and deep-sea canyons.
- Define clearly *to whom* an area is important or valuable, and why the area is significant under Goal 2, Potential Action 2.
- Potential Action 3 ("Identify geographic areas and species that are important for sustenance") needs clarification to indicate whether "sustenance" relates to human consumption or whether this is an economic interest.
- Include both human-related and natural environmental changes when modeling future environmental conditions in Goal 2, Potential Action 5.
- Include human-related changes in Goal 2.
- Include ocean acidification in Goal 2, since it will impact ocean health.

- Add areas for protection of ecosystem services to support communities in climate adaption and climate resilience to Goal 2, Potential Action 3.
- Incorporate ecosystem based management or sustainability science language into Goal 2 and its Potential Actions.
- Incorporate the sustainable socioeconomic aspect of ecosystem based management into Goal 2 and its Potential Actions.
- Remove the Potential Action: “Prioritize science and research needs to fill key gaps in knowledge” because the RPB has no scientific or research collection capabilities, and it would be inappropriate for it to develop directives on how federal and state agencies within the region manage and apportion their own science and research programs.

V. Feedback on Goal 3: Compatibility Among Past, Current, and Future Ocean Uses

The Northeast Regional Planning Body provides the following overview of Goal 3, Compatibility Among Past, Current and Future Ocean Uses: "Develop a planning framework to encourage compatibility among past, current and future uses of ocean and coastal waters while minimizing user conflict and impacts to environmental and cultural resources. Recognize local priorities and the connection of ocean uses and the ecosystem to shoreside infrastructure and activities. Facilitate increased understanding and coordination among stakeholders, recognizing the difficulty of resolving certain conflicts." This section describes the themes of comments received at the public meetings and in written comments in response to Goal 3, as drafted. Please see Appendix A for the full text of the Draft Goals.

a. General Comments

A few participants identified goal three as the most important of the proposed goals. Many commenters said that planning for future uses should be purposeful and grounded in a vision of how New England, as a society and as a region, sees its future and how it would like to define its future relationship with the ocean. Decisions among different uses should be based on this vision. One participant applauded the language of 'developing a planning framework…' but said the potential actions, as written, are not actions that will lead to creation of a framework.

b. Processes for Identifying and Making Tradeoffs and Resolving Conflict

Members of the public encouraged the RPB to acknowledge and clearly identify the tradeoffs that exist between different users and uses. They recommended the creation of a transparent process, including information about where ultimate decision-making authority sits, for identifying and making decisions about these tradeoffs. Many inquired who would be responsible for assigning relative values to different uses and for arbitrating conflicts between user groups.

Some commenters urged the RPB to remember, in resolving conflict between competing uses, that many oceanfront communities are water-dependent and, therefore, that decisions should not be made solely based on economic considerations. For example, someone suggested that the value of potential uses could be weighed against the economic impact of these uses on ocean communities dependent on fishing and other current ocean industries for their livelihood.

A member of the public suggested that the third goal be reframed to focus on the "interests" of different users rather than on the "uses" themselves. This shift in focus would help to avoid positional bargaining (i.e. simply considering the stated positions, or stances, of the parties), which petches user A against user B with one party feeling that they are losing to another party or they are forced to concede/sacrifice. The commenter also proposed the establishment of objective criteria (such as set or kind of scientific data) for decision making that all stakeholders would agree to follow.

Someone proposed that ocean planning consider distances from the shore, along with other factors. For example, planning could be conducted differently for segments within 3 miles of the shore, between 3 - 50 miles from the shore, 50 - 100 miles from the shore, and greater than 100 miles from the shore. This sort of system recognizes that ocean uses vary greatly according to distance from the shore and thereby promotes compatibility of uses.

A commenter suggested that it may be best for the RPB to focus on defining what types of alterations to the environment might be considered (or prohibited) rather than what types of activities/projects would be allowed. This is a lesson learned from Massachusetts' where certain activities related to energy development were prohibited in certain areas. While this zoning-oriented approach may have been intended to head off oil and gas extraction, the intent and wording of the Ocean Sanctuaries Act were called into question when the HubLine natural gas pipeline was proposed.

A member of the public suggested that the RPB work to facilitate discussions between diverse users and agencies on an ad hoc basis, where appropriate, rather than attempting to develop a regional plan about where human activities can and cannot take place. The commenter cited a study of the Massachusetts Ocean Plan that found that smarter ocean planning via taking into consideration key fisheries habitat when identifying wind turbine placement would yield $10 billion more for the energy sector and keep fisheries losses to less than $1 million compared to status quo.

Several commenters indicated the need for a proper spatial plan for energy development to head off case-by-case reviews and public meetings for every energy proposal.

Some participants noted that there are inevitable limitations to planning efforts to address compatibility issues between diverse uses. In many cases, negotiations between users (e.g. between private businesses) may be more effective in resolving conflicts than a regional or government-led process would be. In addition, some expressed uncertainty about our human ability to meaningfully assess current and foreseeable trends and urged caution about basing planning on perceived trends that may not be borne out.

c. Concern About Impacts on Traditional Uses

Some commenters expressed concerns that the ocean planning effort could be simply another way to assign value to specific ocean areas and allocate ocean space, thereby having a negative impact on existing uses such as fishing. More generally, some people noted that the fishing industry and fishermen are under pressure from diverse factors and that this effort might ultimately only contribute to that pressure. Advocates for non-consumptive recreational uses such as surfing, swimming, kayaking, diving, wildlife appreciation and beach-going also asked that these uses be prioritized and protected.

d. Identify Stakeholders

A commenter proposed that the RPB create a network map of stakeholders and interest groups in the Gulf of Maine. Such a map would enhance understanding about the myriad groups that

use coastal and ocean resources in the New England oceans, including the needs, priorities, and interests of these various groups. A mapping process could also help to elucidate the areas of overlap and divergence in interests as well as the connections between these diverse user groups. Once a network map has been created, it could also serve as a springboard for an effort to enhance communication among different user groups.

e. Cultural and Historic Uses

Responding to Potential Outcome 4 ("Working within existing authorities and regulations, information for preserving important cultural and historic sites and traditions"), some participants suggested that the important cultural and historic sites and traditions of *all* ocean and waterfront communities must be recognized, not only those of Native American communities. Some called for an expanded historical perspective that would move beyond a narrow focus on specific historical sites to encompass the centuries of fishing and maritime history in New England. Participants also suggested that maps or an atlas documenting the history of coastal communities be created that feature the history of coastal communities and the various natural features that humans have named over the centuries.

f. Relationship Between Current and Future Uses

Participants recommended that existing uses be respected when decisions are made about the expansion of new uses in the oceans. In particular, some members of the public emphasized the need to protect and preserve the livelihoods of fishermen and the communities dependent on fishermen. To this end, they suggested that the ocean planning process work to maintain working waterfronts by, for example, creating maps that show the locations of working waterfronts and the locations of publically funded infrastructure that supports the fishing and maritime industries. Once these working waterfronts are mapped, future uses can be overlaid on current uses to gauge the impact of the new uses on existing uses. A regional process could help to decide about how these uses should be coordinated and made compatible, especially when some new uses like tourism are perceived to be pushing out the historical port users. A participant suggested the creation of a regional body that establishes protocols regarding stakeholder notification, coordination, communication and interaction. Some participants suggested that the RPB's framing and use of language are both very important, since current users are going to assume that the RPB is trying to put new users on the ocean.

Other people said it is important for all possible uses and users to be considered when making decisions rather than giving priority to certain industries or previous uses. People making these decisions ought to think about future needs and benefits, not just past traditions and patterns of use.

g. Suggested Revisions to the Language of Goal 3

Members of the public suggested the following specific language changes for Goal 3:

- Include the widening of the Northwest Passage under Potential Action 3a.

- Incorporate Goal 2, Action 5 ("Model future environmental conditions, such as potential climate change effects on species' habitat, distribution, and/or abundance") into Goal 3, including how changes in environmental conditions will impact human uses.
- Move Goal 3 Potential Action 3f ("Assess existing shore-side infrastructure that directly affects ocean habitats and species (Combined Sewer Overflows, discharges, etc.) and assess need for improvements)" to the potential actions of Goal 2.
- Include action items in Goal 3 to identify strategies and processes to assess and address conflicts.
- Consider regional infrastructure needs in relation to public interests for the benefit of the region's people and ecological foundations.
- Identify shoreside infrastructure needs and existing shoreside infrastructure's problems and opportunities to mitigate or remove these problems.
- Move Goal 2, Potential Action #5 ("Consideration of regional infrastructure needs incorporated into existing authorities and decision-making") to the Potential Actions under Goal 3.
- With regards to the Potential Action, which reads: "Assess current and foreseeable trends in commercial fishing in New England, relying on information available through fisheries management efforts."
    - Add the term "recreational and" before the term "commercial" to recognize and include the economic, social, and cultural values of recreational fishing.
    - Fisheries management efforts should not be the sole source of data used to establish fish/ catch management, as the current and enormous controversy surrounding stock assessments and catch limits in New England illustrates.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: DRAFT GOALS DOCUMENT

Draft Goals for Northeast Regional Ocean Planning

Introduction

At the April 2013 meeting of the Northeast Regional Planning Body (RPB), state, federal, New England Fishery Management Council, and tribal RPB members[1] discussed regional ocean planning goals. A key outcome of this meeting was a set of draft goals, for which preliminary actions and potential outcomes have been developed for discussion with stakeholders and the public. This document outlines this information to be presented at a series of public meetings in May and June throughout New England (see this website for meeting details: http://northeastoceancouncil.org/regional-planning-body/public-meetings/). The Northeast RPB is convening these public meetings to continue operating in a transparent manner with broad stakeholder participation. At its next meeting in the fall of 2013, the Northeast RPB will consider public input received and revise these draft goals, actions, and outcomes.

The goals, potential actions, and outcomes described below incorporate extensive stakeholder input to date. They are a starting point to help identify and prioritize discrete actions and progress that can be made on ocean management issues in New England.

Specifically, the Northeast RPB would like your feedback on the following questions:

1. *Which aspect of each goal (and its accompanying actions and outcomes) do you like and why? Which aspects would you change?*
2. *What should the priority outcomes and actions be for each goal for the next two years, and why?*

As you think more about these questions, please consider the following framing principles:

1. The ocean and its resources are managed for the benefit of the public, now and in the future.
2. The historic, cultural and spiritual importance of the ocean are important to consider.
3. The present and past connection between communities, watersheds and ocean is important.
4. New ocean uses are emerging and existing ocean uses are changing.
5. There is concern about changing ocean "health" and ecosystem conditions.
6. Better data and information, including traditional knowledge, will lead to better understanding and decision making.
7. There is a need for improved government efficiencies and transparency.
8. We need to adapt as environmental, social and economic conditions change.
9. Importantly, regional ocean planning outcomes must be implemented through existing authorities and regulations. Neither the National Ocean Policy nor regional ocean planning create or change existing authorities.

[1] The Northeast Regional Planning Body has convened pursuant to the National Ocean Policy, which President Obama signed in June of 2010 (for more information: http://www.whitehouse.gov/administration/eop/oceans). More information on the Northeast Regional Planning Body, including its work to date and membership, can be found here: http://northeastoceancouncil.org/regional-planning-body/.

The remainder of this document provides three draft goals for regional ocean planning in New England, accompanied by potential outcomes for consideration. Possible actions to achieve these outcomes are presented for illustration purposes.

Goal: Effective Decision Making
Improve management effectiveness, intergovernmental decision making, engagement, collaboration, and integration of best available knowledge. Reflect ever changing social, environmental, and technological conditions.

Potential Outcomes:

1. Improved decision-making time as a result of better coordination among agencies and increased availability and accuracy of information
2. Reduced appeals and conflicts during permitting
3. Increased transparency and better public understanding of decision-maker roles and opportunities for input
4. Decisions made with improved respect for the customs and traditions of the indigenous peoples concerned
5. Consistent regional data, maps and other information contributing to efficiencies in project review, project-specific studies, mitigation, and timing
6. Regional data and science priorities addressed and incorporated into management decisions on an ongoing, adaptive basis
7. Better understanding of the cumulative impacts of different potential uses at varying scales

The following actions could be undertaken to achieve the outcomes listed above.

Potential Actions:

1. Incorporate regional data and maps into regulatory processes
2. Increase interagency coordination across management and regulatory programs
3. Inform and engage the public for better decision making
4. Coordinate and leverage science, traditional knowledge, and data development to address regional priorities
5. Conduct regional cumulative impacts analysis utilizing improved environmental and ocean use information and data

Goal: Healthy Ocean and Coastal Ecosystems
Develop a planning framework to protect, restore, and maintain healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems that provide social, cultural, spiritual, and economic benefits. Account for changing environmental conditions and new information as it becomes available. Respect the intrinsic value of the ocean, its biodiversity, and act as its steward/caretaker, recognizing humans as part of the ecosystem.

Potential Outcomes:

1. Areas of regional importance for birds, marine mammals, fish, benthos, and sustenance are identified as appropriate, considering the availability of existing information
2. Maps of species, habitats, and areas of regional importance (e.g. areas of high productivity, diversity, spawning, and/or critical habitats) are incorporated in existing decision making processes
3. Current understanding of changing conditions is accounted for in management responses
4. Priority list of regional science and research needs with an action plan to address priorities
5. Greater recognition and understanding of the connection between riverine water quality and healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems

The following actions could be undertaken to achieve the outcomes listed above.

Potential Actions:

1. Map species and habitats; assess trends
2. Working within existing regulations and authorities, use publically-accessible maps and trends to define and characterize important, significant, or valuable areas
3. Identify geographic areas and species that are important for sustenance
4. Identify opportunities within existing regulations and authorities for restoration and protection
5. Model future environmental conditions, such as potential climate change effects on species' habitat, distribution, and/or abundance
6. Prioritize science and research needs to fill key gaps in knowledge

Goal: Compatibility Among Past, Current and Future Ocean Uses

Develop a planning framework to encourage compatibility among past, current and future uses of ocean and coastal waters while minimizing user conflict and impacts to environmental and cultural resources. Recognize local priorities and the connection of ocean uses and the ecosystem to shoreside infrastructure and activities. Facilitate increased understanding and coordination among stakeholders, recognizing the difficulty of resolving certain conflicts.

Potential Outcomes

1. Assessment of the regional coastal and ocean economy
2. Maps of existing human uses, and identification of potential future changes to those maps, used to help minimize conflicts and informing siting of new uses
3. Maps of areas with higher potential for paleocultural resources
4. Working within existing authorities and regulations, information for preserving important cultural and historic sites and traditions
5. Consideration of regional infrastructure needs incorporated into existing authorities and decision-making
6. Identification of priority needs for shoreside infrastructure upgrades
7. Greater recognition and understanding of the connection between inland resource use and associated impacts on ocean resources

8. Greater understanding of the compatibility among ocean uses to inform implications of management decisions

The following actions could be undertaken to achieve the outcomes listed above.

Potential Actions:

1. Identify and where possible map existing uses (fishing, boating and other recreation, shipping and commerce, etc.) and related infrastructure. Identify practical implications of new and changing activities on the regional economy and environmental and cultural resources (including potential paleocultural resources)
2. Identify and map cultural and historic sites
3. Enhance viability of and compatibility among new and existing ocean uses, specifically by considering the following, drawing upon existing sources of information where available and appropriate:
    a) Assess current and foreseeable trends in maritime commerce, particularly related to potential implications of short-sea shipping, the widening of the Panama Canal, and other economic drivers
    b) Assess current and foreseeable trends in commercial fishing in New England, relying on information available through fisheries management efforts
    c) Assess current and foreseeable trends in ocean-based renewable energy development on the regional economy, compatibility with other existing uses, regional electricity transmission, and other related issues
    d) Assess potential for offshore aquaculture, particularly considering the regional nature of this ocean planning effort, existing federal regulatory framework, and technology trends
    e) Assess current and foreseeable uses of seafloor material (extraction for beach nourishment or siting of disposal areas), considering recent storms and related federal and state responses, long-term trends, needs for disposal of dredged material, and related issues
    f) Assess existing shore-side infrastructure that directly affects ocean habitats and species (Combined Sewer Overflows, discharges, etc.) and assess need for improvements

APPENDIX B: SAMPLE PUBLIC MEETING AGENDA

Below is a sample public meeting agenda. Please note that agendas in Massachusetts and Rhode Island were adjusted to make time for presentation and discussion of the state's respective ocean planning processes.

Northeast Regional Planning Body
Public Meeting on Draft Regional Ocean Planning Goals

[Location]
[Address]

[Date and Time]

Agenda

4:00 Welcome and Introductions

4:15 Background: National and Regional Ocean Planning:

- Overview of ocean planning – Betsy Nicholson, Federal RPB co-chair, or other RPB member

4:40 New England's Ocean: What do we know, and what information are we collecting?

- Presentation of maps and products being developed for regional ocean planning – Nick Napoli or John Weber, NROC
- Participants review maps and products and give their input and suggestions

5:20 Feedback on Draft Regional Ocean Planning Goals

- Presentation of draft goals and actions – Betsy Nicholson, Federal RPB co-chair, or other RPB member
- Public Comment on:
    - Which aspects of the draft goals do you like or would you change and why?
    - Of the example actions and outcomes under each goal, which do you think should be the priorities? Other suggestions?

6:45 Wrap Up & Next Steps

7:00 Adjourn

APPENDIX C: MAP COMMENTS

Written comments received during the public meetings about the maps created by NROC are reproduced below.

General Comments

- How about some maps showing the areas already identified by the state - that are leaking pollution into the bay; should be planning on how to stop it
- Lobster conservancy - diane cowan --> re: juvenile lobster research

Aquaculture

- How do you show potential?

Commercial Fishing

General Feedback:

- Looks good! Keep up the good work!
- Is state trip level reporting (nonfederal vessels) included?
- But what does this really tell us since there are area restrictions that in part shape where people fish and how much activity there is? Vessel size?
- Empty areas on VMS data are indicative of efficiency closed areas which were implemented to push fishermen off the best fishing grounds and slow down harvest before quotas. Casks, jeffreys, and areas I and II look like no fishing activity, but is actually best fishing areas. These are the worst places to put other uses that might kill fish

Suggestions for Other Data to Include

- Municipal aqua development zones?

Energy and Infrastructure

General Feedback:

- Need empirical studies regarding cables
- (Fwd Cable Protection Committee) 1. Using ICPC guidelines make buffer zones so existing submarine cables + pipelines may be services. 2. Show on chart which cables + pipelines are active and online. 3. Make room for future submarine cables and pipelines. 4. Read ICPC recommendations on wind farm placement
- Where are the cables going?
- Leah has a map of eastern CT infrastructure that we need
- It appears that cable areas and pipelines almost always overlap (or that pipelines only occur in coincidence with cables). Is that right? If not, remove shading inside pipeline areas

- It is unclear what the difference is between a cable and a submarine cable. It would be helpful to see a definition of the different infrastructure types or an explanation of where they are located with respect to the surface or seafloor.

Suggestions for Other Data to Include:

- Additional project sites that ORPC "abandoned"
- Create additional "hypothetical" map that such as stations
- Stellwagen Cable missing
- Costal and … e.g. map RR bridges + landslide transportation networks
- Need to map costal power plans (plants?)
- Disposal sites should be on the infrastructure map
- Add to this map: public safety facilities, us coast guard, marine police stations, map LIDAR and elevation data because it relates to SLR
- Expand, define and map infrastructure: sewage treatment facilities, CSOs, dams + tide gates
- Milford Iroquios pipeline missing
- Black Island Sound App., hazardous dumping area
- How about wind energy sites on coastal islands
- Shouldn't the wind turbines along shore of Narragansett Bay be shown as well?
- Is there a way to indicate the status of the proposed energy project facilities?
- There are definitely data missing - e.g. Hubline submarine pipeline + laterals to Neptune and Northeast Gateway. For MA & RI - should show recommended use areas that arose from their ocean plans

Natural Resources

General Feedback:

- Identification of Important Ecological Areas: *areas of high productivity and biological diversity, *areas of key species that are critical to ecosystem function and resiliency, *areas of spawning, breeding, feeding, *areas of rare or functionally vulnerable marine resources, *migratory corridors
- Identification of data needs to be more specific - "summer" - ? An average over how many days/what days/how many years data or one sample?
- For biological: *use seawater picture *inter-annual (capture wet/dry)
- How long/what duration was each effort? Standard effort? Again, define spring - how does time frame relate to migration pattern?
- How will species be selected for indicator of natural resources? Are there studies of rafts of pelagic birds that could be mapped? Prey items abundance and distribution?
- Need better breakdowns that show more detail
- Where is the spatial extent of the effort? -HD
- Like to see more deference to ocean current/river flow, Scotian Current impact on our resources, the functions and values to the ocean environment that this region provides
- Why summer? Most of our regional 1° production happens in spring bloom and secondary fall bloom. Summer sea surface color likely more indicative of dissolved organic matter, sediment, etc. - Heather Deese

- What is "summer" + "spring"? What years? Are video/gif loops available?
- No mining please.
- Boil harvest maps down to common metrics. Value harvest per unit area, # of human meals harvested per unit area, jobs created per unit area. Also: acknowledge distortion of fisheries data due to deliberate reduction in fishing efficiency due to non-habitat classed areas
- Marine mammal maps - useful to show years included. There have been notable inter-annual shifts in distribution on Stellwagen Bank for instance relatable to food resources. Also should indicate the level of effort. Very seasonally-biased

Suggestions for Other Data to Include:

- Maps should include a symbol to indicate station locations/coverage so that CPUE doesn't mislead in areas that are not sampled - HD
- Why use a bottom travel survey to indicate herring abundance? Herring is a pelagic species. Use the herring acoustic survey - Heather D.
- Seasonal pathways -- different species
- Zooplankton + micro zooplankton - especially protozoa, critical first food for yolk sac hatching cod
- Can you add a confidence interval? (All 4 maps.) What about potential habitat mapping?
- Bluefin tuna, sharks, leatherback, kemps ridley, fishery dependent and fishery independent data on HABITAT utilization

Recreational Boating Map

General Feedback:

- How do we better deal with spatial resolution or lack thereof? Also: implied precision vs. accuracy
- How do we make the method of obtaining the data end of analyzing and interpreting it more transparent?
- Do the data capture time spent in an area or only that someone passed through? Eg did someone spend a lot of a time in a bay or anchorage or just quickly pass through?
- Why are only 30% of the surveys represented in this chart?
- What do the activity levels represent? High = 40 trips? Med = 20 trips? Etc…

Suggestions for Other Data to Include:

- Non-consumptive/non-motorized recreational data gap - MG surfrider
- Lack of color seems to indicate no activity, which isn't correct. Consider also showing actual tracks in background in light grey
- Include data about public launches - may help capture sea kayaking. Windjammer fleet?
- Does this include: *sea kayaking? It should! *Commercial tour operators (whale watching, etc)
- Launching areas + access sites should be included
- Noted at other meetings, but there is a HUGE data gap where non-consumptive, non-motorized recreational interests are concerned. Surfider has a few proposals in the works to study these and help fill this cap for the rec. kayakers, surfing, scuba, etc. would be great to see additional resources -- thank you - Melissa Gates, Surfrider

- As well as a study on commercial fisheries, look to include a study on "nonconsumptive ocean use." Recreational uses including surf, kayak, scuba, canoe, etc. especially in near shore areas need to be heard - Tyler Archer, Surfrider
- Non-motorized, non-consumptive usage data? Beach visitors for swimming, surfing, kayaking, SUP, snorkeling. Number of participants? Economic impact? - Jamie McCallum Surfrider (NH)
- Boundary between the boating activity layer and the shoreline isn't clear. Adding a boundary (shoreline) would be helpful especially around islands.
- Data gap in non-consumptive, non-motorized recreation use (beach going, kayaking, surfing, kite surfing, scuba, snorkel) - Melissa Gates

Transportation and Navigation

General Feedback:

- Ocean disposal sites - not all active, should segregate; Steve Wolf has database - USACE New England Disctrict - Active/inactive/historical - Temporary CWA
- Need to make sure colors for different things are distinguishable even on hard maps and online
- Describe the items in the legend more completely
- Disposal site for what? Active?

APPENDIX D: PUBLIC OUTREACH CHANNELS

The following methods of outreach were employed to inform members of the public about the ten public meetings soliciting input about the draft goals.

LONG FORM ANNOUNCEMENT

State	Publication	Date Submitted
ME	Bangor Daily News	5/6/13
ME	Ellsworth American	5/3/13
ME	Commercial Fisheries News*	5/3/13
ME	Island Advantage	5/8/13
ME	Courier-Gazette	5/3/13
ME	The Working Waterfront	5/3/13
NH	Seacoast Online	5/6/13
NH	Foster's Daily Democrat	5/6/13
RI	The Providence Journal	5/3/13
RI	RI Public Radio	?
RI	South Country Independent	?
RI	Newport Daily News	?
RI	Jamestown Press	?
RI	Block Island Times	?
RI	Narragansett Times	?
RI	Providence Business News	?
RI	Westerly Sun	?
CT	New London Day	5/6/13
CT	New Heaven Register	5/6/13
MA	Boston Globe	5/6/13
MA	Gloucester Times	5/6/13
MA	Cape Cod Times	5/6/13
MA	The Standard-Times	5/6/13

*NROC submitted listing independently

SHORT FORM ANNOUNCEMENT

State	Publication	Date Submitted
ME	The Working Waterfront	5/3/13

PUBLIC NOTICE

State	Publication	
CT	Hartford Courant	5/8/13
ME	Portland Herald Press	5/3/13

CALENDAR LISTING

State	Publication	Date Submitted
ME	Bangor Daily News	5/6/13
ME	Ellsworth American	5/9/13
ME	Island Advantage	5/10/13
ME, NH	Seacoast Online	5/9/13
NH	Portsmouth, NH Patch	5/10/13
RI	Narragansett South Kingston Patch	5/6/13
RI, CT	New London Day	5/10/13
CT	New Haven Register	5/8/13
CT	New Haven Independent	5/8/13
MA	Boston Globe	5/6/13
MA	Gloucester Times	5/6/13
MA	Cape Cod Times	5/6/13

LISTSERV ANNOUNCEMENT

State	Publication
NH	Rip Tide E-Info
NH	Piscataqua Region Estuaries Partnership
NH	Seacoast Science Center
NH	Blue Ocean Society for Marine Conservation