

**Massachusetts Ocean Partnership Fund
Annual Partners' Meeting
April 2, 2008**

Meeting Brief

Partners and prospective partners of the MA Ocean Partnership Fund held their annual meeting on April 2, 2008. This **one-page brief** highlights key issues at-a-glance; the **summary that follows** provides a more detailed accounting of the meeting. In addition to being distributed to partners and prospective partners, this summary is also available on the MOPF website. (www.mopf.org)

Introductions

Previous, new and prospective partners described their organizations', agencies', and associations' motivation for being "at the table" and expectations of a "successful outcome".

MOPF Updates

Andy Rosenberg, current MOPF Governing Board Chair and Stephanie Moura, Executive Director, updated participants on MOPF developments and highlighted key themes.

- MOPF received an \$8.2M grant from the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation to advance integrated ocean management in MA over the next 3 years; the grant requires a \$2.5M match. MOPF views the match requirement as an opportunity to leverage public and private funding through collaboration with partners on projects and activities that serve mutual ocean management objectives.
- MOPF, a public-private partnership driven by its broad-based partners, is overseen by a diverse Governing Board and executive staff. Partners are encouraged to participate through any of multiple avenues, including serving on a Working Group or Committee. MOPF is an unincorporated entity fiscally sponsored by and housed at UMass Boston.
- The partnership will initiate independent collaborative problem solving outside the constraints of regulatory processes; MOPF's stakeholder involvement and science integration efforts will also directly support the state's formal ocean management planning and decision making processes.

Secretary Bowles' Remarks

EEA Secretary Ian Bowles addressed the partners, emphasizing the state's continued commitment to developing and implementing integrated ocean management for the Commonwealth's ocean waters, acknowledging the effort invested thus far by agencies and other stakeholders and noting EEA's intent to collaborate as a MOPF partner, with CZM serving as the state's lead ocean management agency.

Meeting Outcomes

Working Groups. Much of the day focused on identifying and further clarifying priority projects/activities and initiating formation of cross-sectoral working groups of partners to guide those efforts. Priority projects for year one include: developing a shared framework for integrated ocean management, making progress toward an integrated, dynamic data network and appropriate modeling tools for decision support, and engaging in collaborative problem solving on priority issues. MOPF expects to issue RFP's for the framework and data network activities by mid-May.

Governing Board (GB) Elections. Two partners were nominated to fill vacancies on the GB: Bill Adler of MA Lobstermen's Association and Jack Wiggin of Urban Harbors Institute. (Note: Subsequently, Jack Wiggin withdrew his nomination in the interests of accommodating the broadest possible representation on the Governing Board, while confirming his continued participation as a partner.) At its next meeting, the GB will elect its officers; results of the GB member and officer elections will be announced promptly.

Name change? A great majority of participants recommended MOPF drop the "F" and henceforth be known as the Massachusetts Ocean Partnership, or "MOP" when an acronym is needed. The Governing Board will consider this recommendation at its next meeting.

Meeting Summary

Introductions and MOPF Updates

The meeting was chaired Andy Rosenberg, current MOPF Governing Board Chair; Stephanie Moura, Executive Director, updated participants on MOPF developments. Developments and key themes included:

- Partners have an opportunity to advance integrated ocean management in MA waters by a) cultivating a problem-solving forum to generate ideas outside the typical constraints of regulatory venues that will inform formal decision making processes and b) by developing information and tools that improve the integration of natural and social science with management.
- MOPF received an \$8.2M grant from the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation to advance integrated ocean management in MA over the next 3 years; the grant requires a \$2.5M match. Funding will be used to achieve MOPF's collaborative problem solving and science integration goals/objectives (grant "outcomes/outputs") summarized in the 4-page attachment.
- MOPF views the match requirement as an opportunity to leverage public and private funding through collaboration with partners on projects and activities that serve mutual ocean management objectives. Match money may come directly to MOPF but is just as likely to be met through partners' work related to MOPF outputs. MOPF's Financial Sustainability Committee (Chaired by Priscilla Brooks of CLF and Vice-Chaired by Robbin Peach, MOPF Co-PI/Sr. Advisor) has prepared a draft fundraising plan (available upon request) and will be seeking partners to serve on the committee. Partners can collaborate on fundraising efforts by sharing contacts, identifying programs/activities suitable for collaboration as well as other ways to be identified by the committee.
- MOPF's independence will enable the partnership to engage in problem solving outside the constraints of regulatory processes and to address priority issues identified by the partners. At the same time, to ensure the partnership's relevance, MOPF's stakeholder involvement and science efforts will directly support the state's formal ocean management planning and decision making.
- MOPF, a public-private partnership driven by its broad-based partners, is overseen by a Governing Board and Executive Director. Partners are encouraged to participate through any of multiple avenues, including serving on a Working Group or Committee. MOPF is an unincorporated entity fiscally sponsored by and housed at the University of Massachusetts Boston/McCormack Graduate School of Policy Studies (Stephen Crosby, Dean). The attached PowerPoint presentation from the meeting includes a conceptual diagram of MOPF's structure.
- Nick Napoli was recently hired as MOPF's Science Program Manager and will begin work in late April. The Communications/Outreach Manager and Administrative Coordinator are expected to be on board by early May.

In addition to existing partners, several new and prospective partners attended. During introductions, participants were asked to address three questions; below is a summary of their remarks. An asterisk (*) indicates an item was noted by a few to several participants.

Why is your organization/agency/association "at the table"? Responses fell into two main categories:
Management/policy/process

- Recognize the need for more effective, balanced multi-sectoral management of marine waters*
- Cutting edge opportunity for MA to be first state with effective integrated ocean management*
- Opportunity to *really* integrate research, science and technology into planning and management*
- Partnership has the potential to be a unique and constructive vehicle for issue resolution*
- Served on the 2003-04 MA Ocean Management Task Force*

Interest based

- Represent marine trades wanting to plan for future and prosper from continued shorefront access
- Advocate for range of port/maritime/commerce/navigation/public safety and security interests
- Serve as point agency to lead state's ocean management efforts
- Bring federal perspective and expertise on ocean policy/management issues

- Host MOPF as its fiscal sponsor
- Represent conservation interests*
- Engaged in active ecosystem or socioeconomic research in MA/GOM area*
- Protect viability of commercial fishing / lobstering businesses
- Rely on continued use of Mass Bay for regional wastewater discharge
- Enhance public understanding of ocean science/policy from historical perspective
- Promote offshore renewable energy through a responsible process/framework
- Connect MA efforts with GOM regional ocean management efforts
- Maintain City of Boston's strong maritime connection
- Interested in the nexus of marine science/policy and consensus building
- Articulate the range of stakeholder expectations for how MA coastal oceans should be used

What would a successful outcome for your organization/agency/association look like (today or overall)?

- Identify and work on common issues outside the regulatory process*
- Develop useful science products and employ innovative stakeholder processes ultimately resulting in an effective integrated ocean management plan for MA*
- Develop clear, predictable rules for managing ocean uses across jurisdictions through an inclusive process; evolve beyond "wild west" approach to ocean management*
- Create effective and durable partnerships across sectors through trust-building and high caliber engagement marked by effective communication and personal interaction*
- Leverage resources needed to accomplish partners' individual and collective work
- Develop solid scientific basis for integrated ocean management, identify and address gaps*
- Build UMass Boston profile in environmental policy
- Export MOPF template/strategies to other states or regions
- Broaden agency participation in a comprehensive water quality monitoring program
- Development of water quality regulations with a more rational link to policy objectives
- Reform ocean management in the context of climate change
- Improve how science is communicated/translated to decision makers and other non-scientists
- Translate lessons-learned from land-based and coastal zone management to offshore
- Enhance public understanding of ocean science/policy/management

What questions do you bring to today's meeting?

- What are the priority issues where partners can add value through collaborative problem solving?
- What are the interests / needs of *prospective* partners?
- What is MOPF's role vis-à-vis state's planning efforts?
- How will science-based integrated ocean management be reflected in regulations?
- What are MOPF goals and objectives?
- What are the benefits to *my particular* agency/organization/business of participating in MOPF?
- Is there an agreed upon definition of "sustainability"?

Secretary Bowles' Remarks

EEA Secretary Ian Bowles addressed the partners, emphasizing the state's continued commitment to developing and implementing integrated ocean management for the Commonwealth's ocean waters, acknowledging the effort invested thus far by agencies and other stakeholders and noting EEA's intent to collaborate as a MOPF partner, with CZM serving as the state's lead ocean management agency.

Working Groups

To advance the partnership's substantive work, much of the day focused on clarifying the first three science integration objectives and the priority issues for collaborative problem solving efforts and initiating formation of cross-sectoral working groups of 8-12 partners to advise and serve as a sounding board for MOPF projects/activities. These discussions are summarized below. Participants agreed on the need for developing appropriate **ground rules** for working groups to **ensure transparency while also safeguarding confidentiality**.

Framework for Integrated Ocean Management

The schedule for partnership efforts to support development of a shared conceptual and operational framework for integrated ocean management is being accelerated given the likelihood of ocean management legislation being signed into law by the close of the current legislative session. MOPF is currently preparing an RFP to secure consultant services to assist in the framework efforts. In a break-out group, several participants discussed the scope of this project. Key points included:

- MOPF's work will not reinvent the wheel but rather learn from/build on integrated ocean management / EBM and other related approaches elsewhere while aiming to tailor them to the specific needs of MA.
- The state, led by CZM, is currently developing its formal approach to ocean management planning. For MOPF efforts to be most effective, they must be responsive to the state's needs and to the broader needs of the partnership.
- Participants expressed a range of perspectives on what constitutes a "framework" and what form MOPF's product might take.
 - Process and/or product? Some participants emphasized decision making and advisory *processes and structures* needed to support ocean management planning and others emphasized development of ocean management *product/output* options (Ocean zoning? Streamlined environmental review and permitting? Other?)
 - Options and/or recommendations? Some felt a thoughtful evaluation of framework options may be more appropriate than offering a recommended approach to the state. Others felt that building consensus among diverse partners is necessary for making any framework effective and durable.
- There was broad agreement that an ocean management framework must be informed by a thorough assessment of stakeholders' needs - known existing needs and anticipated future needs, conditions, uses and technologies.
- Goal setting and identifying shared principles upon which to base a plan is important.
- Participants acknowledged that political realities and priorities will always be a factor in management and policy decisions, but emphasized that employing a stakeholder supported, science based framework will offer greater transparency, a more thorough and explicit accounting of ecological and economic tradeoffs, and ultimately lead to more effective and durable management decisions.
- It was agreed that the Framework Working Group must be a broad and balanced group of partners including resource agency managers, industry and conservation interests. Several participants expressed interest in serving on this Working Group.

Data Network and Modeling/Scenario Analyses

It was agreed that the data network and modeling/ scenario analyses work is closely linked and these working groups should be combined. MOPF expects to issue initial RFPs for consultant services to assist in the data network and modeling efforts in the near future. In a break-out group, several participants discussed the scope of these projects. Key points included:

Process/Terms of Reference

- Explore options for appropriate/qualified service providers.
 - Who? Consortium, MA GIS, GOM group, others.
 - How? Approach to integrating natural and social/economic data, linking data with modeling.
- Take partners' needs into account in design of data network and modeling.
- Describe "basic" products needed and gaps to fill. (Uses, habitat, etc.)
- Consider ways to add value, optimize investment.
- Identify rich research/experimentation areas suitable for the longer term.
- Develop data discovery protocols to make private data accessible, to the extent possible.
- Several participants expressed interest in serving on this Working Group.

Integrated Data Network

- Coordinate with/ build on the multiple existing efforts in the region and state.

- Identify and utilize *existing* information for current ocean planning needs; invest in identifying and *supplementing* information to address key management questions going forward. Where can MOPF provide value added?
- Identify and work through institutional and technical data sharing barriers.
- Incorporate government, NGO and private data sources; make data sharing a permit condition.
- Integrate, connect, and make available spatially explicit data sets: habitat, water quality, fisheries, existing infrastructure and human uses, economic value of services generated within an area, etc.
- Google Earth-like zooming capabilities?
- Incorporate key value-added components:
 - Dynamic capabilities (not static)
 - Socioeconomic/human use data
- Ensure broad accessibility through “one stop shopping” portal; enhance connections among stakeholders.
- Improve interoperability among data sets.
- Generate useful products for policy makers, resource managers, researchers, user groups and public.
- Clarify hosting arrangements, maintenance requirements and “customer service” needs for data network.

Modeling

- Clarify purpose of modeling – to explore management “what ifs” and answer specific questions; not modeling for modeling’s sake.
- Modeling should be connected to partners’ needs/interests – “application pull”.

Priority Collaborative Problem Solving Topics

MOPF will convene working groups in a non-regulatory setting to seek collaborative solutions to difficult ocean management issues and generate options for consideration in formal decision making processes. The focus, composition and charge of each working group will be determined by the partnership for MOPF-initiated topics and, in cases where the state seeks specific stakeholder advice on certain topics/issues, EEA/CZM will play a primary role. In a discussion and exercise aimed at identifying priority topics, participants reviewed issues generated during MOPF’s planning phase, developed a list of additional suggestions and looked for linkage among related topics. By an informal show of hands participants then indicated which topics they felt were a priority. The table below reflects the results.

Collaborative Problem Solving Working Groups Topics/Groupings	% ID’d Priority
Provide an informal sounding board for specific coastal ocean development proposals to provide proponents information on important stakeholder interests/issues before a project begins its formal review and permitting process	≈ 66% identified this issue grouping as a priority
Identify considerations for criteria to guide siting new or exclusive uses in the coastal ocean (e.g. offshore wind, LNG, desalination facilities, etc.)	
Develop guidance for improving the allocation of mitigation packages to ensure accountability for supporting the objectives of integrated ocean management	
Identify redundancies and gaps in management of the land – sea interface . How will port plans, coastal zone management plans, municipal harbor plans, etc. relate to an integrated ocean management plan?	≈ 50-66%
Explore options /needs for implementing integrated ocean management at the local level .	
Explore relevant cases to improve understanding of cumulative impacts - e.g. cobble mining/beach nourishment-hazard protection/fisheries habitat; coastal build-out; dredging/dumping; etc.	≈ 50%
Offer partnership capacity building opportunities- e.g. collaborative negotiation training	≈ 33-50%
Serve as a safe harbor for frank discussions around legislative or executive initiatives affecting ocean management	<10%

Governing Board Elections

MOPF operating policies allow up to 15 to comprise the Governing Board; currently 11 partners serve. The annual meeting was an opportunity to fill vacancies by election of the partners. Discussion emphasized the importance of balancing public – private representation and ensuring sectoral diversity on the Governing Board. One nomination was received prior to the meeting in response the advance e-mail appeal (Bill Adler– Executive Director, Massachusetts Lobstermen's Association); one nomination was offered from the floor (Jack Wiggin – Director, Urban Harbors Institute); and no additional names were offered by the close of the nominating period on April 4. (Note: After the meeting, Jack Wiggin withdrew his nomination in the interests of accommodating the broadest possible representation on the Governing Board, while confirming his continued participation as a partner). At its next scheduled meeting on April 30, the Governing Board will elect its officers – a Chair and Vice-chair. Results of the Governing Board member and officers elections will be announced to the partners promptly.

MOPF Name Change?

MOPF's name and its somewhat awkward acronym have long been the subject of discussion. Participants brainstormed alternatives and considered the possibility of a name change. Alternatives included:

- No change, keep MOPF
- Drop the "F" to become MOP
- Refrain from using acronyms and just refer to the "Massachusetts Ocean Partnership"
- PFOM (pronounced like "foam")
- BSOP – Bay State Ocean Partnership
- COMP-MA - Comprehensive Ocean Management Partnership – Massachusetts

By an informal show of hands a great majority of participants indicated that MOPF should drop the "F" and henceforth be known as the Massachusetts Ocean Partnership or MOP when an acronym is called for. The Governing Board will consider this recommendation at its next meeting.

MA OCEAN PARTNERSHIP FUND

Participant List for April 2, 2008 Partners' Meeting

Name		Affiliation
Bill	Adler	MA Lobstermen's Association
Priscilla	Brooks	Conservation Law Foundation
Amy	Breault	UMass Boston/MOPF
Jack	Clarke	Mass Audubon
Mel	Cote	EPA Region 1
Fara	Courtney	Good Harbor Consulting
Jud	Crawford	Conservation Law Foundation
Steve	Crosby	UMass Boston/McCormack Graduate School
Verna	DeLauer	COMPASS
John	Duff	UMass Boston – EEOS
Susan	Farady	The Ocean Conservancy
Kathryn	Ford	MA Division of Marine Fisheries
Deb	Hadden	Massport
Andy	Hammond	Boston Pilots Association
Jim	Hunt	City of Boston
John	Jensen	Sea Education Association
Les	Kaufman	Boston University – BUMP
Kate	Killerlain-Morrison	The Nature Conservancy NE Region
Mary-Lee	King	MA Office of Coastal Zone Management
Leslie-Ann	McGee	MA Office of Coastal Zone Management
Heidi	Miller	US Coast Guard
Rob	Moir	MA Ocean Coalition
Stephanie	Moura	MOPF
Nick	Napoli	MOPF
Robbin	Peach	UMass Boston/ MOPF
Judy	Pederson	MIT SeaGrant
Andrea	Rex	MWRA
Leona	Roach	MA Marine Trades Association
Andy	Rosenberg	University of NH - EOS / Joint Ocean Commission Initiative
Dave	Terkla	UMass Boston- Economics
Greg	Watson	EOEEA - Energy
Jack	Wiggin	Urban Harbors Institute