

Northeast Regional Planning Body: Fall 2017 Meeting Meeting Summary

Meeting held November 16, 2017 in Exeter, NH
Prepared by the Consensus Building Institute

MEETING IN BRIEF

At its November meeting, the Northeast Regional Planning Body (RPB) reviewed and obtained feedback on the progress of the implementation of the Northeast Ocean Plan (Plan). The RPB decided on next steps for key Northeast Ocean Data Portal updates and RPB subcommittee and work group activities. The RPB also learned about tribal priorities and discussed next steps to address those priorities. The meeting provided frequent opportunities for public comments on the topics under discussion. Presentation materials from the meeting can be found in the meeting briefing packet: http://archive.neoceanplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Nov-RPB-briefing-packet_FINAL.pdf

MEETING SUMMARY – KEY THEMES

Below is a summary of key themes discussed at the meeting. This summary is not intended to be a meeting transcript. Rather, it focuses on the main points covered during the RPB Meeting.

Implementation and Use of the Northeast Ocean Plan

RPB discussion

Ted Diers, state co-lead from New Hampshire, asked the RPB to imagine a scenario in which an offshore transmission cable project was proposed in federal waters in the Gulf of Maine and discuss how the RPB would answer three key questions:

- Data needs – What advice would RPB members give to the proposing entity on how they should think through their data needs?
- RPB coordination – How would the RPB coordinate between themselves, how would they let others know, how would they put the project on the Portal, and how would they bring in tribal contacts?
- Public engagement – What would the public engagement process look like?

During the discussion period, RPB members asked the following questions and made the following comments, grouped by theme:

- Formalizing RPB coordination
 - *Concerns and considerations*
 - How can the RPB formalize the organic communications it already has while working within existing authorities and protocols? Each RPB entity has a different process for analyzing projects. Some regulations prevent agencies from dedicating their own resources before they receive a formal application request for a meeting or permit. For them, the process does not start until this first step occurs. How can these different processes adapt to

- the RPB now in the mix? Can RPB members work within their respective authorities to build a more formal communication structure?
- The RPB cannot rely on relationships to drive the process; this was not the purpose of the Plan. Relationship-driven communication is not “early and often” and is almost too late. We also cannot leave this to applicants.
 - What is the RPB value-add? What can we do differently because of the Plan?
 - It is critical that state historic preservation offices (SHPOs) and tribes with jurisdiction are alerted and consulted early in the planning process.
 - What is the best way for states to proceed with federal consistency checking?
- *Potential solutions*
 - What lessons can the RPB learn from the federal review and coordinating team for Hurricane Sandy? This clearinghouse group holds monthly meetings and for each proposed project, there is an opportunity for public comment.
 - Could the RPB create a structure that includes an established first-point-of-contact review team of RPB members who can launch the process? Could the RPB establish a formalized “portal” or distribution list for all incoming projects to alert tribes, federal agencies, and coastal states?
 - Can the RPB formalize this process through Coastal Zone Management policies?
 - New Executive Orders regarding streamlining the permitting process for infrastructure projects may be an opportunity but this approach should be carefully considered.
 - Additional partners
 - FERC is important in these discussions but it is not a full member – how can the RPB bring FERC to the table?
 - Connection to the Portal
 - How can we link RPB coordination and communication back to the Portal intentionally?
 - Instructions and advice to applicants
 - Could the RPB put out a “best practices” document for potential applicants instructing them in the kind of process RPB members would like to see? *The RPB discussed this subject in more detail during the “Best practices in decision-making” segment of the meeting.*
 - Roles
 - What is the states’ role in project proposals located in federal waters? Suggested options include registration with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), coordinating state Coastal Zone Management policies, and extending states’ Geographic Location Description (GLD).
 - Outreach
 - Proposed projects are fairly concrete when they are submitted to federal agencies, however, many entities and the public feel they have missed their best opportunity to weigh in at this point. How can we create a culture for applicants to vet their

projects and engage early in outreach, even limited outreach? How can we help constituents have a voice early in the process? This is part of the RPB's role.

Public comment

Jennifer Felt (Conservation Law Foundation)

- Thank for your work to advance the regional implementation of the Plan. We appreciate the advance meeting materials and encourage the RPB to continue this practice.
- CLF is working on how stakeholders can be involved in the Plan implementation. We support Richard Nelson's idea of a comprehensive project inventory and timeline that is regularly updated; this would be an important tool for stakeholders to understand where they can be involved in the process.

Nick Battista (Island Institute)

- We are concerned that two issues of major importance to Maine are either missing or insufficiently displayed on the Portal: lobstering activity and working waterfronts. Both issues are mentioned in the Plan. If we direct project proponents to the Portal, but not to read the Plan as well, they are missing important information. These two issues have a huge spatial and financial footprint and it is critical they exist on the Portal.
- We are also concerned with late stakeholder engagement. While it is not the federal agencies' responsibility to notify us, can the RPB develop a best practices document for applicants to review early in their planning? The state agencies know their own stakeholders best; can they play a role in alerting us? How can the RPB allow stakeholders to engage early in the process?

Brent Greenfield (National Ocean Policy Coalition)

- Replying to the RPB's conversation about GLD and CZM policies, the NOPC has concerns about state applications of the CZMA that could delay or block projects if they are not consistent with federal rules. The CZM plans are state-specific and may not align with the RPB's activities.
- We agree on the utility of early consultations but imposing a consultation requirement would go beyond existing authorities, especially if the project lacks sufficient details.
- The Portal is still missing important datasets (e.g. seasonal records). If RPB members are directing applicants to the Portal, it needs to have better dataset and tool caveats.

Jeff Neild (CH2M)

- We are a contractor for offshore wind developers and we are glad to see the progress being made. We support much of what was said during the RPB discussion.
- When I am asked to review business plans for new projects, I would love to have a regulatory matrix listing the RPB contacts I need to work with.
- Desktop analysis on the Portal is great. We have introduced clients to the Portal and the RPB.
- I am not sure you need a new regulatory coordination process - that can be a little scary - but the RPB can help with regulatory coordination. It would be great to see more regulatory information on the Portal. For example, the IPASS system from USFWS provides information about ESA risks in an area for a project. I have not seen such a tool

on the Portal. You could also include an appropriate contact name for a species to reach out to when we get hits on the Portal.

- When I see this data, with multiple indices, I want to know why these matter. When you put these tools up, you need to provide good information in the “about” box to help Portal users.

Richard Nelson (Commercial fisherman)

- I am more confused now than when we began. I am not sure what to expect next.
- Planning should be planning – we should be prepared, know where are we going, ask good questions, and be proactive. The discussion today sounded reactive to applications but you should be proactive. I support this Plan but I want to see you be brave. We need to create something new and not return to being reactionary.
- We cannot rely on political influence to protect the ocean. What influence should Portal-builders or fishermen have in this process? When can we decide what is good for our ocean?

Sally McGee (The Nature Conservancy)

- TNC hosted an excellent workshop in September with the Portal staff. We want to support more training like this and make sure we reach a larger audience of stakeholders from the fisheries, energy, and transportation sectors.

Melissa Gates (Surfrider Foundation)

- I echo Jennifer Felt’s comments on the great progress being made.
- Recreation and tourism is the leading driver of our ocean economy and yet we still get left out of the conversation when projects come to the table. A state “ping” is not enough; please do not leave out other voices. States may not invite everyone who should be at the table – I had to be loud and informed to get involved. You cannot do all the right stakeholder engagement on your own.
- We have data on potentially affected stakeholders in these sectors. We have a list of contacts and collected data. You could also allow the public to self-select: there could be a form on the Portal or RPB website that allows individuals to opt in to sectors where they see themselves as an affected stakeholder. We want to identify ourselves.
- We would love to see early-stage projects be publically available while balancing the need for these proposals to be organized and cohesive.

Northeast Ocean Data Portal Updates

Presentation and RPB Discussion

Nick Napoli (contract staff to the Northeast Regional Ocean Council) presented a summary of the proposed Northeast Ocean Data Portal priorities for 2018.

The 2018 priorities fall into four themes:

1. Understand and promote use of the Portal
2. Conduct outreach and trainings
3. Enhance functionality and content

4. Maintain and update priority data

Priority 4 will focus on two major data umbrellas: human use and marine life, habitat, and Components of Ecological Importance (CEIs). From late 2017 through 2018, the Portal team will work to complete human use data updates and stakeholder outreach for energy and infrastructure, commercial fishing, marine transportation, recreational activities, and the lobster fishery. For the latter two data areas, the team is also refining options for data presentation and identifying potential partners and funding sources for longer-term projects. The Portal team will spend 2018 updating the marine life and habitat data products and determining options for long-term maintenance. They will also complete and post initial data layers and tools for the CEIs.

The Portal team will continue to identify human use and marine life data products or packages that may support current issues or fill key data gaps. They will also develop a long-term plan for Portal assets and functions. The team currently relies on grant funding to support the Portal but would like to see new funding from agencies, if possible. During the discussion period, RPB members made the following comments and expressed the following concerns:

- Communication and outreach – How can the public and interested stakeholders receive updates on areas they are interested in? Can they opt into particular “list serves” on the Portal?
- Data caveats – The Portal should have clear information where data is missing or requires a caveat. RPB members are concerned about the appropriate use and interpretation of data products, especially aggregated products.
- Audience – There remains uncertainty about the appropriate audience and how the Portal should be used.
- Portal updates – Who should be responsible for ensuring projects are posted on the Portal in a timely fashion?
- Best practices through training – RPB members see great value in Portal trainings. It is particularly important that these trainings are working sessions where participants can connect the Portal’s assets to their own work. It would be particularly useful for some trainings to be cross-agency to help build common practice. For example, several federal agencies have already incorporated Portal tools into their guidance documents. These could serve as case studies for any agencies still developing their implementation plans. Training participants can also help the Portal developers refine the available products. The Portal team should build out its current online trainings.

Public comment

Allison Lorenc (Conservation Law Foundation)

- We appreciate the MDAT team’s work; yesterday’s data workshop was excellent.
- Stakeholders need to be involved in the process and these data packages can help. It is important to have options for stakeholders to dive in as far as they need to.
- CLF staff found the Portal trainings very valuable.

Chris Maguire (The Nature Conservancy)

- The Portal team has been great to work with and this has contributed to the bump in Portal visits.

- The Portal team’s work with the coral management amendments data would make an interesting case study. We have put alternatives up on the Portal and examined when those need to change.
- Can you talk about your coordination with the Marine Cadastre and the Mid-Atlantic Portal? Many fisheries work in both the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic regions and having multiple data portals can be confusing. *Mr. Napoli: There is coordination – many of our team members work on both of the Portals. Large datasets come through the Cadastre and we process the data. When datasets cover both regions, you are looking at the same data on each Portal. There are also state compilations of data within the regions.*

Brent Greenfield (National Ocean Policy Coalition)

- We appreciate the RPB comments about documenting how the data will be used. The public needs to see guidance from agencies about how they will use that data.
- Metadata on the Portal and areas of uncertainty should be made clear.

RPB decision about next steps

There were no objections to the data plans and priorities as laid out by Mr. Napoli so these were approved.

Tribal Priorities

Tribal co-lead Elizabeth James Perry (Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (Aquinnah)) presented tribal priorities for 2018.

- Regional collaborations – Recent calls and conferences have shaped the thinking about tribal collaborations region-wide. There is great interest in long-term planning for restoration and reestablishing coastal health in tribal territories. Many tribes have hunting and fishing rights that depend on good ocean planning and the RPB’s efforts are a crucial component of this.
- Case study – Some tribal groups are interested in developing a case study around an ocean development project to track tribal involvement. This case study would detail the consultation process and how the Portal is utilized. This would be an opportunity for tribes to learn about the process and practice Plan implementation with federal and state agencies.
- Portal training – Tribal groups are interested in receiving more training on how to use the Portal, both in-person and online. RPB members offered the following suggestions to support this:
 - Betsy Nicholson (NOAA) noted that Michael Stover at the EPA holds monthly calls with a multi-agency collaborative group focused on developing best practices for tribal consultation and planning. When tribes are brought on to this call in the future, it may be an opportunity for the Portal team to deliver training.
 - Asha Ajmani (Passamaquoddy Tribe at Pleasant Point) suggested scheduling training sessions at major tribal conferences to make these sessions more financially accessible.
- Permitting contacts and timelines – Tribal groups would like to have the list of relevant permitting agencies and the timelines for when they need comments.

Subcommittee Updates and Next Steps

Restoration subcommittee

Larry Oliver (USACE) presented a summary of the RPB Restoration Subcommittee's recent activities and plans for 2018.

Given limited resources, the Subcommittee proposes that each state and tribe provide it with 10 representative restoration projects to post on the Portal. These projects should be shovel-ready projects that only lack funding. The Portal metadata will include points of contact for each project and jurisdiction so applicants and funders can reach out for more information. The Subcommittee will develop metadata parameters (e.g. cost information, project phase, expected ecological outcomes) to provide some consistency across the Portal. The Subcommittee will update and make publically available the list of funding sources for restoration projects. The end user or audience for this dataset is funding agencies, financial decision makers, and project applicants. Ivy Mlsna (EPA) noted that the Subcommittee lacks a state co-chair and they are requesting self-nominations.

During the discussion period, RPB members asked the following questions and made the following comments. *Direct responses from Mr. Oliver and Ms. Mlsna are in italics.*

- How is the Subcommittee doing membership-wise? *We have only had two meetings and have not had great representation so far. We can identify some representation gaps for you if you would like. One gap we would like to address is participation by tribal groups. Sharri Venno (Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians) has been a great participant and we would like more representation.*
 - Ms. Venno: We would like to add Asha Ajmani to this Subcommittee as the tribal co-chair.
- Can we collaborate with the North Atlantic Landscape Conservation Cooperative (NALCC) and its database around restoration projects? USFWS employees staff the NALCC and other agencies and some NGOs are also involved. The NALCC focus is on land conservation but restoration is a key part of that work. *Is the most appropriate use of this group to link to relevant databases like the NALCC and NOAA databases? Or should we provide 10 representative projects per jurisdiction? We can probably do both of these. The metadata could include links to other regional restoration efforts. We would need guidance from the RPB on the value of this path.*

Sand management subcommittee

Jeff Reidenauer (BOEM) presented a summary of the RPB Sand Management Subcommittee's recent activities and plans for 2018.

The Subcommittee has seven priorities for 2018:

1. Maintain datasets related to the identification and use of resources on the OCS.
2. Develop an Offshore Sand Resources theme on the Portal.
3. Characterize areas for future sand resource data collection and assessment.

4. Incorporate the Plan and the Portal into environmental reviews associated with the identification or use of sand resources.
5. Ensure agencies use the Plan and the Portal.
6. Continue regional collaborations to identify sand needs and potential sand resources.
7. As funding allows, conduct additional geological and biological investigations of offshore sediment resources and pursue and intergovernmental effort to coordinate the use of sediment resources.

Mr. Reidenauer reviewed some recent milestones for offshore sand resources. He highlighted BOEM's Final Rule on Negotiated Noncompetitive Agreements 30 CFR 583 published on October 3, 2017 and an opportunity for better regional coordination through the Northeast Sand Subcommittee. On a funding note, states have been helping BOEM identify offshore sand resources over the last four years through ongoing State Cooperative Agreements. The second round of these agreements ends in 2018 so BOEM is trying to determine how to maintain these relationships and cooperative agreements in the future. BOEM is preparing to solicit stakeholder feedback on ideas to address priority gaps in the FY19-21 Environmental Studies Plan. As part of their Marine Minerals Program, BOEM has created a Marine Minerals Information System (MMIS). BOEM would like to use this resource in coordination with states to identify and protect materials for future uses. They would also like to host a Sand Subcommittee meeting to discuss roles and responsibilities for regulations that guide the development of offshore sand resources.

During the discussion period, RPB members asked the following questions and made the following comments. *Direct responses from Mr. Reidenauer are in italics.*

- Have these sand resources been vetted for archaeological impacts? *Yes, we analyze these sand bodies for archaeological resources. We have not issued any leases or permits in New England yet but we have in New Jersey, the southeast, and the Gulf of Mexico. All these areas are vetted through the National Historic Preservation Review under Section 106. All of the data is reviewed by archeologists and we add a buffer if we identify a cultural resource.*
- Is there tribal representation on the Sand Subcommittee? *Not presently but we would be happy to welcome someone.* It is important for tribes to have an early opportunity to vet these resources on a map. Tribal engagement is very important.
- How consistent is archeological vetting across the agencies? *We are just beginning to coordinate with tribes and need more information on this subject.*
- The upcoming solicitation for feedback on the FY19-21 Environmental Studies Plan is a big opportunity to link with the research needs identified by the RPB in Chapter 5 of the Plan. Please let us know when this solicitation will go out.

Public comment

There were no public comments.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Plan implementation

Best practices in decision-making

Jennifer McCarthy (USACE) and Chris Boelke (NOAA Fisheries) led a discussion on the use of best practices in decision-making.

The RPB continues to struggle with the question of “what are we doing differently because of the Plan?” Key areas to develop or refine best practices are inter-agency coordination (e.g. pre-application meetings) and early engagement with applicants (e.g. BOEM reference in Renewable Energy Guidance, USACE public notice to applicant). The decision-making (i.e. regulatory) process is reactive by nature and some RPB members are not regulatory agencies so the planning process is the best vector for establishing best practices. Lack of authority and often capacity, however, may limit the scope to existing processes.

The RPB is also wrestling with the question of “how do we measure success?” While some metrics are easy to quantify (e.g. visits to the Portal), others are more difficult to capture (e.g. best practices). The Portal continues to see increasing traffic as more users learn about this resource but metrics are needed. The presenters are interested in suggestions for measuring success but are also wary of the time and resources this effort may consume.

During the discussion period, RPB members asked the following questions and made the following comments:

- Plan implementation at the agency and office level
 - The Plan necessitates examining our day-to-day activities and decision-making. The USCG is currently implementing this (e.g. consulting the Portal and Plan to help locate new aids to navigation).
 - The National Ocean Plan was formally implemented at NOAA through a NOAA Administrative Order to implement any certified regional plan. NOAA also has an internal implementation plan for each office to understand their requirements. NOAA can share this matrix.
 - Some RPB members are not at the point where they can implement the Plan on the day-to-day level. For some members such as the USACE, their lens is only the regulatory process. The Plan was designed to be useful to many different entities (e.g. identifying restoration opportunities, reviewing permits); how can we capture these different approaches? We could develop case studies of different uses of the Plan by different agencies.
- Early agency coordination and communication with potential applicants
 - Pre-application meetings are critical to starting a project on the right foot. These should include affected states, federal agencies, tribes, and SHPOs. Rhode Island, for example, requires pre-application notification. Pre-application meetings, however, vary by agency and state. Some agencies do not include non-tribal and non-federal stakeholders in these preliminary meetings. The RPB and its members can strongly suggest but cannot require pre-application consultation or processes outside existing authorities.
 - What is the most efficient way for applicants to gain feedback from multiple agencies? Are joint meetings early in the planning process possible?

- Are there ways to enhance current regulatory processes to gather more information and improve coordination? Nearly everything needs to go through the USACE Section 10 process. Can we look at that process for improving coordination and input? This could take the form of a guidance for potential applications that encourages them to use the Portal and request pre-application meetings, but this would not change the actual Section 10 process.
- There is great value in pre-application meetings but there is also the risk of meeting with applicants too early when the details are still missing. What is the best approach for handling proposals in the very early stages of planning? There may also be hesitation about putting details on the Portal because plans may change.
- Where do project applicants see room for improvement in the current process?
- Early outreach to stakeholders
 - A key area to develop best practices is in how we create opportunities for early input on projects. This is particularly important for groups like the fishing industry. How can we connect agencies and other stakeholders before proposals are submitted?
 - Projects die based on siting choices at the beginning of the process. Pre-application meetings and early stakeholder engagement are crucial for not just the project, but for the whole category of projects.
 - How can we encourage applicants to pursue stakeholder outreach on their own without requirements from regulatory bodies? States are an important ally for identifying the right stakeholders.
- Other uses
 - Documenting these implementation efforts is useful for state agencies on the RPB to show their other state partners.

Progress report

Building off the best practices discussion, Mr. Diers led a discussion of how efforts to capture changes could be communicated to the public through a regular progress report. A progress report can help the RPB identify gaps and areas for improvement but the RPB co-chairs need more clarity on the report's contents. The RPB had the following suggestions:

- The Council on Environmental Quality built a spreadsheet with all the elements of the National Ocean Plan to track where they were making progress. We could build a similar spreadsheet for the approximately 40 recommendations in the Plan.
- Data updates may lend themselves to a spreadsheet but other efforts such as coordination are more about looking at how the plan is used.
- It could be helpful to look at our ability to advise applicants pre- and post-Plan, perhaps in the form of a case study.
- Should we define success as applicants asking for pre-application meetings?
- The RPB could track if stakeholders and applicants feel like the Plan makes their work easier. Do they feel like we are getting to better outcomes? We could measure this through surveys in stakeholder communities or feedback questions that accompany each permit.
- The Portal could include pop-up, quantitative satisfaction surveys to gather feedback.

- How can we use the Plan to structure the progress report?

Public comment

Priscilla Brooks (Conservation Law Foundation)

- I want to underscore the need to develop best practices for stakeholder engagement. How can we codify this process? Stakeholder engagement is a pillar of the Northeast Ocean Plan.
- This not just about agency-agency coordination, but also agency-stakeholder engagement and coordination. We need to be proactive on this issue. Rhode Island's habitat and fisheries advisory boards are great examples. Is a working group on this issue an appropriate move?

Nick Battista (Island Institute)

- Do not limit the progress report to 2017. Include any relevant work before this year.
- Applicants are not the only target audience for the progress report - stakeholders who are impacted by projects are also the audience. The Plan allows those stakeholders to hold the RPB and its members accountable. Consider ways to display how a community member can see the Plan impacting their daily life.
- We should separate the stakeholder outreach conversation from the conversation about what data is on the Portal. The Portal is not comprehensive and it is not the end of outreach needs. It is one tool but we need to develop best practices for reaching out to potentially impacted stakeholders. Are agencies thinking about using the Plan and Portal outside of permitting activities?

Brent Greenfield (National Ocean Policy Coalition)

- Please make publically available on the Portal and on the RPB website the matrix Betsy Nicholson mentioned and any guidance documents agencies develop.
- As you develop best practices, please continue to communicate them to the public.
- Agencies should allow the public to provide comment on draft public notices or guidance documents related to the Plan implementation.

Richard Nelson (Commercial fisherman)

- We need to talk about all the goals in the Plan, not just agency coordination – goals like restoring ocean health and compatibility of ocean users. The RPB discussion makes it sound like these do not exist outside the permitting process but they do. How can we make progress on these goals without waiting for a project to react to?

Larry Oliver (USACE)

- Is there something in the Plan that lists the agencies and stakeholders we should talk to at the beginning of a project? It would be good to make it easy for agencies and applicants to find this information.

Ecosystem health

2018 Ocean Health Index Work Plan

On behalf of the OHI team, Emily Shumchenia (contract staff to the Northeast Regional Ocean Council) reviewed the 2018 Ocean Health Index (OHI) Work Plan. The team's draft timeline for 2018 is:

- Early January 2018 – Public webinar to update the RPB and stakeholders on the OHI assessment progress and gather input on key topic areas.
- Spring 2018 – Hold virtual focus groups to gather input on topic areas. Hold workshop (virtual or in-person) to share feedback from webinar and progress calculating draft OHI goals.
- Summer & Fall 2018 – Incorporate feedback and continue to calculate scores and communicate with key audiences.

The RPB does not fund this effort though it has committed to use the RPB network to provide input into the OHI process. The OHI is one of many regional initiatives to track ocean health. It will provide additional context for activities in the region but it will be difficult to link changes in the OHI to anything in the Plan. For more information or to get involved in the upcoming activities, interested individuals should email Courtney Scarborough (scarborough@nceas.ucsb.edu) and copy Nick Napoli (nicknapoli01@gmail.com) and Emily Shumchenia (emily.shumchenia@gmail.com).

Integrated Sentinel Monitoring Network

Ru Morrison (NERACOOS) reviewed recent activities of the Integrated Sentinel Monitoring Network (ISMN) steering committee.

Mr. Morrison reviewed the origins of the ISMN, its goals, and its three steering committee work groups. The ISMN steering committee is currently working to build out the infrastructure to support their goals and looking for the necessary funding. They are focused on observing activities coordination for federal and state agencies but want to move ahead with establishing the Center for Analysis Prediction and Evaluation (CAPE). In 2018, ISMN will host a number of workshops around data integration, monitoring efforts and methodologies, monitoring assessment, and CAPE governance. Fisheries and Oceans Canada is particularly interested in collaborating on this effort. The ISMN steering committee would like to involve tribes in this effort. Elizabeth James Perry (Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (Aquinnah)) suggested the steering committee reach out to tribal natural resource departments and SHPOs.

Final Thoughts

Mr. Napoli and Mr. Diers closed the meeting with a few final thoughts:

- Meeting frequency – The Plan calls for biannual RPB meeting. Does this frequency need to change?
- Best practices – Please continue these discussions about implementation best practices. We would appreciate Jennifer McCarthy and Chris Boelke continuing their efforts with the additional help of Michele DesAutels (USCG) and Betsy Nicholson (NOAA).
 - Ms. Nicholson noted that Chapter 3 of the Plan contains actions with clear theme leaders. This sub-group should involve these leaders in developing best practices.
- Coordination across regions – Several Mid-Atlantic RPB members attended today's Northeast RPB meeting. Mr. Diers and Ms. Nicholson are attending other RPB meetings

in the coming weeks to continue strengthening relationships and developing best practices across RPBs.

MEETING PARTICIPANTS

RPB members

Name	Affiliation
Asha Ajmani	Sipayik Environmental Department, Passamaquoddy Tribe at Pleasant Point
Joe Atangan	U.S. Navy
Bruce Carlisle	MA Office of Coastal Zone Management
Michele DesAutels	USCG
Ted Diers	NH Dept. of Environmental Services
Kathryn Ford	MA DMF
Clark Freise	NH Department of Environmental Services
Grover Fugate	Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Council
Simon Gore	Water Power Technologies Office, U.S. Department of Energy
Elizabeth James Perry	Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head Aquinnah
Kathleen Leyden	State of Maine/Maine Dept of Marine Resources
Jennifer McCarthy	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Meredith Mendelson	Maine Dept. of Marine Resources
Betsy Nicholson	NOAA
Jeff Reidenauer	BOEM
Brian Thompson	CTDEEP
Chris Tompsett	U.S. Navy
Sharri Venno	HBMI

Other government staff

Name	Affiliation
Chris Boelke	NOAA/NMFS
Ian Dombroski	EPA Region 1
Marianne Ferguson	NMFS
Darlene Finch	NOAA Office for Coastal Management
Heather Hopkins	Naval Undersea Warfare Center
Julia Lewis	First Coast Guard District
Kevin Madley	NOAA NMFS GARFO
Daniel Martin	NOAA Office for Coastal Management
Ivy Mlsna	EPA
Mary Anne Morrison	U.S. Navy
Ru Morrison	NERACOOS
Becca Newhall	NOAA
Larry Oliver	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Prassede Vella	Massachusetts Office of Coastal Zone Management
Jeff Waldner	BOEM Marine Minerals
Chris Williams	New Hampshire Coastal Program

Facilitation team

Name	Affiliation
Dory Dinoto	Consensus Building Institute
Rebecca Gilbert	Consensus Building Institute
Nick Napoli	Northeast Regional Ocean Council
Emily Shumchenia	Northeast Regional Ocean Council

Public

Name	Affiliation
Eva Barnett	Green Fire Productions
Nick Battista	Island Institute
Priscilla Brooks	Conservation Law Foundation
Rebecca Clark Uchenna	Island Institute
Jesse Cleary	Marine Geospatial Ecology Lab, Duke University
Susan Farady	UNE
Jennifer Felt	Conservation Law Foundation
Melissa Gates	Surfrider Foundation
Jenn Greene	NROC Portal
Brent Greenfield	National Ocean Policy Coalition
Amber Hewett	National Wildlife Federation
Alix Laferriere	The Nature Conservancy
George Lapointe	NROC Consultant
Dennis Long	Consultant
Allison Lorenc	Conservation Law Foundation
Anne Merwin	Ocean Conservancy
Kate Morrison	Mid-Atlantic Regional Council on the Ocean
Stephanie Moura	None given
Richard Nelson	Commercial Fisherman
Jeffrey Nield	CH2M
Marta Ribera	The Nature Conservancy
Whitley Saumweber	Stanford University Center for Ocean Solutions
Amy Trice	Ocean Conservancy
Jenna Valente	American Littoral Society
Larry Ward	University of New Hampshire Center for Coastal and Ocean Mapping
Dan Zukowsky	Writer/Reporter