DRAFT

Stakeholder Participation in Massachusetts Ocean Management Planning: Observations on the Plan Development Stage

June 8, 2009

Prepared by:

The Consensus Building Institute *and*
The Massachusetts Ocean Partnership

Stakeholder Participation in Massachusetts Ocean Management Planning: Observations on the Plan Development Stage

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Stakeholder and Public Participation Opportunities

The Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA) expended considerable effort in outreach to the general public and ocean-use stakeholder groups over a 12-month period from June 2008 through May 2009. These efforts provided numerous opportunities for stakeholder participation during the initial, formative stage of the Massachusetts ocean management planning process. This report lists the primary stakeholder involvement vehicles used and the overarching themes that emerged.

The primary stakeholder participation vehicles included:

- An Ocean Advisory Commission (OAC) comprised of seventeen organizations, agencies and specific interests specified by the 2008 Ocean Act legislation (the Oceans Act) (the OAC met six times in total);
- Eighteen public listening sessions around the state in fall 2008, (generating participation from approximately 300 individuals);
- Sixty-six interviews with stakeholder groups during fall and winter of 2008 (reaching over 110 representatives), plus repeated meetings with certain groups;
- Open meetings of the Science Advisory Council (SAC), also established by the Oceans Act;
- An OAC/SAC Ocean Management Planning Principles Workshop in November 2008, (with participation from 30 stakeholder representatives in addition to the OAC and SAC attendees);
- Two stakeholder workshops in February 2009 to explore data available for planning, (involving 110 participants);
- Two OAC meetings in May 2009 to examine distilled ocean use data and initial use compatibility assessment options, and to allow initial stakeholder comment, (over 130 stakeholder representatives attended these sessions);
- An EEA Public Input Portal (providing 24/7 online access to technical materials and allowing for comment submission);
- Several Massachusetts Ocean Partnership (MOP) events with EEA participation, (each attracting approximately 30-50 stakeholder representatives); and a
- MOP website which supplemented EEA's web presence with additional communication tools (event webcasting video feeds, summary reports, etc.).

Through its collaboration with EEA, MOP provided significant financial, strategic, technical and logistical support services for the state-led stakeholder involvement efforts.

Themes That Emerged

Stakeholders repeatedly expressed appreciation for the extensive opportunities to learn about, discuss and comment on the ocean management planning process and its products. Many questions were raised about the ultimate impacts of the MA Ocean Management Plan (the Plan) on specific interests and needs, and participants supplied important information (data) about their respective ocean uses for consideration in the planning process. Key observations include:

- The OAC served an important, but not fully representative, public and stakeholder involvement function;
- The one-on-one stakeholder group interviews created considerable dialogue, significantly facilitated information sharing and educated stakeholders about the Plan development process;
- The stakeholder involvement workshops were conducted in a spirit of open communication and the attendees expressed appreciation for the opportunity to speak freely with the EEA planners. The sequencing of the information presented in the two workshops from data overview, to data overlays, to compatibility discussions and management options was a productive element of the engagement;
- The public listening sessions were a valuable first step, but attendance was less than robust in most locations beyond the key coastal cities;
- Open SAC meetings helped introduce certain stakeholder groups to the concepts behind some scientific underpinnings of the planning process;
- EEA participation in MOP partnership meetings provided valuable opportunities for cross-sector discussions while reinforcing the transparency of the state's efforts; and
- Web tools (including EEA/MOP websites, webcasting, list serves, etc.) enhanced participation at all stages of the stakeholder involvement process.

Continued, substantive stakeholder involvement is integral to the concept of ecosystem-based ocean management and should remain a foundational component of the state's efforts to promulgate and successfully implement the Plan.

END.

Stakeholder Participation in Massachusetts Ocean Management Planning: Observations on the Plan Development Stage

FULL SUMMARY REPORT

Introduction

The purpose of this report is to examine stakeholder involvement with ocean management planning in Massachusetts during a 12-month period (from June 2008 through May 2009) and to present observations and themes that emerged. The Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA) expended considerable effort to reach out to the general public and stakeholder groups during the initial, formative stages of the planning process. Continued stakeholder involvement is integral to the concept of ecosystem-based ocean management and should remain a foundational component of the state's efforts to promulgate and successfully implement the Massachusetts Ocean Management Plan (the Plan).

The term stakeholder usually means "affected interest." Most affected interests are organized into associations or non-profit groups, and thus stakeholder outreach is almost always targeted to groups of those affected by policies. Interest groups typically have more technical and legal resources than the general public, are directly affected in some way by decisions and have the ability to influence policy through their advocacy and influence among stakeholders. The term "public" used in the phrase "public participation" often refers to the larger more diffuse citizenry, whether or not organized into interest groups. Different strategies are used for communication and outreach to these two types of interested groups. This report covers both forms of outreach, but uses the general term stakeholder involvement to refer to the full range of tools for communication with stakeholder groups and the public.

There were several layers of and options for participation in the EEA stakeholder involvement efforts conducted to date:

- The 2008 Ocean Act legislation established an Ocean Advisory Commission (OAC) comprised of organizations or specific interests specified in the legislation and designated by either the legislature or the Governor. The designated members included: legislators, an environmental group representative, regional planning organizations, a commercial fishing industry representative, someone with expertise in renewable energy, and the state agencies that manage the coastal zone, fisheries and environmental protection. This group met regularly in six meetings that were open to the public.

- The Oceans Act also legislated the establishment of a Science Advisory Council (SAC) comprised of state agency and other scientific experts to advise the EEA planners about the information base for planning. The meetings of the SAC were open to the public and many stakeholders attended the meetings. This stakeholder participation was essential to building confidence in the scientific information underlying the Plan.

- Additional outreach to stakeholder groups and the public included:

    - Eighteen public listening sessions around the state during the fall of 2008;
    - Sixty-six interviews with various stakeholder groups during the fall and winter of 2008;
    - An OAC/SAC Ocean Management Planning Principals Workshop in November of 2008;
    - Two stakeholder workshops held on Cape Cod and in Boston in February 2009 to explore the data available for planning; and
    - Two OAC meetings held on Cape Cod and in Boston in May 2009 to examine refined ocean use data, initial use compatibility assessment options and allow for initial stakeholder comment.

Through its collaboration with EEA, the Massachusetts Ocean Partnership (MOP) provided significant financial, strategic, technical and logistical support for these state-led stakeholder involvement efforts.

In addition to the state-led efforts, MOP convened several meetings of its Partners, a cross-sector group of ocean-use stakeholders who work together to support integrated, multi-use ocean management planning. These independent forums provided additional process transparency for EEA while helping stakeholders better understand and constructively participate in the state's ocean management planning process.

This report examines the utility of the stakeholder involvement efforts undertaken during the planning phase. In general, stakeholders repeatedly expressed affirmative appreciation for involvement opportunities and they requested continued information sharing and dialogue as the Plan proceeds toward implementation and eventual revision.

Looking Back: Observations on Stakeholder Involvement during the Planning Process
(June 2008-May 2009)

Ocean Advisory Commission: The OAC met six times[1] between August 2008 and May 2009. The topics discussed at these meetings included an Overview of the Planning Process, Presentation of Results from the Early Stakeholder Outreach, Goals and Objectives for the Plan, an Outline of the Plan Strategies and Actions, Initial Compatibility Analyses and data screening, and Conceptual Management Approach.

Observations on this form of stakeholder involvement include:

- The OAC embodied considerable legitimacy for stakeholder involvement in the planning process— the group was established in the legislation and the composition and terms were mandated;
- OAC meetings improved the planning process transparency;
- There was a direct link to the Legislature through legislators on the OAC;
- Government agencies and other affected entities were able to bring broad implementation considerations to the discussions;
- Not all potential stakeholder groups were officially represented on the OAC. Commercial fishing, renewable energy and conservation interests were included, but the marine trades, recreational fishing, aquaculture, transportation, navigation, and others were not; and

[1] Two of the six meetings (in early May, 2009) were duplicates of each other in content, but were held in different locations to accommodate stakeholder participation.

- The charge of the OAC to serve as a stakeholder forum was not always clear, for example, it was unclear from the legislation if the OAC was charged with serving as a mechanism for constituency input from the full range of constituencies for ocean planning.

Stakeholder Interviews[2]: Through direct outreach to individual stakeholder groups via 66 in-person and telephone interviews (with follow-up meetings for some groups), EEA consulted with a broad range of interests potentially affected by the Plan.

Observations about this type of stakeholder involvement include:

- EEA staff responsible for developing the Plan were highly accessible and open to the stakeholder groups;
- The interview process elicited a range of perspectives and thoughtful commentary about the planning process, management options, and data;
- The EEA planners gained access to a wealth of information that increased the usefulness of the knowledge base for the Plan;
- Process transparency was enhanced;
- Stakeholder groups were educated in some detail about the EEA planning process and the expected product;
- Stakeholders were educated about their role going forward in the planning process; but the interviews were very time consuming for EEA staff.

OAC/SAC Ocean Management Planning Principles Workshop (November 2008): This half-day workshop was designed to help the OAC/SAC membership explore the principles and options behind Ecosystem Based Management (EBM) and ocean management planning. Workshop participants looked at various planning models from around the world. In addition to OAC and SAC participants, over 30 stakeholder group representatives attended.

This type of stakeholder involvement:

- Enhanced process transparency;
- Allowed cross fertilization of ideas and planning concepts (across ocean use sectors and between SAC and OAC membership);
- Educated stakeholders on complex planning concepts; and
- Could have benefited from additional workshops so that increased understanding of the highly technical ecosystem-based management concepts could be communicated to affected groups.

Stakeholder Involvement Workshops (February, 2009): Two workshops were held in February to update stakeholders and the public about progress on the Plan development. The workshops were identical, with the Cape Cod and Boston locations allowing geographic access for the wider range of stakeholder groups and interested public. These workshops were also webcast live.

[2] Detailed information about the content of these meetings and other stakeholder involvement efforts are presented in the Appendix.

Observations about this type of stakeholder involvement include:

- The Cape Cod and Boston locations allowed good participation with over 100 groups or individuals represented;
- The information presented helped foster an appreciation for the challenges intrinsic to the planning process while educating stakeholders about the process;
- Informal interaction around the maps allowed stakeholders to gain a more detailed understanding of the data and communicate directly with EEA personnel;
- There were common themes and questions asked at both the Cape Cod and Boston sessions which helped to identify key issues and planning priorities;
- The stakeholders appreciated the multiple venues and the webcasting, because this made the meetings more accessible; however, the tight planning time frame resulted in reduced lead-time for publicizing the sessions.

Stakeholder Involvement in OAC meetings (May 2009): While all OAC meetings were open to the public, stakeholders were invited to two identical OAC meetings held in Boston and Cape Cod locations to allow additional interaction concerning the progress of the Plan. These meetings included presentations on spatial data overlays and use compatibility issues, as well as conceptual management approach options.

Observations about these stakeholder involvement forums include:

- There was a significant level of information exchange;
- The meetings were made accessible through the multiple venues and webcasting;
- There was thoughtful discussion of key management options and challenges, including some convergence on which management approach might work best;
- Map explanation in small groups allowed some hands-on tailored discussion;
- There was relatively little time in the meeting format for significant give-and take with stakeholder representatives; and

MOP Partnership Meetings with EEA Participation: MOP Partners met quarterly during the planning period. Attendance ranged from 20 to over 35 stakeholder groups at each meeting.

Observations about this form of stakeholder involvement include:

- There was considerable opportunity for cross-sector dialogue among stakeholders in a neutral setting;
- They provided training opportunities in skills for effective collaboration;
- Planning process transparency was enhanced as Partners had additional access to updates on planning progress directly from EEA planners and the MOP team, and were able to ask questions, speak about their needs for additional discussion and involvement in the development of the plan; however, the fact that these meetings were on a parallel track with EEA-led meetings required careful parsing of roles to avoid confusion (which was done successfully).

Public Participation Efforts: In addition to the direct efforts to involve stakeholder groups, EEA used other methods to involve the general public in learning about and providing input to the planning process. These efforts primarily consisted of public listening sessions around the state.

Public Listening Sessions: EEA led eighteen (18) listening sessions across the state in the fall of 2008. These sessions provided an opportunity for some three-hundred (300) people to comment as the planning effort began in earnest.

Observations about this type of public involvement include:

- They allowed preliminary dissemination of public information about the Plan and the process for developing it;
- The extensive, repeated, and geographically diverse opportunities provided vehicles for citizens to comment early in the process;
- The sessions provided an opportunity for EEA to learn which issues were foremost on the public and stakeholders' minds as the process began;
- EEA learned that participants had clear ideas about what they would like to see included (information about what would be protected, managed, and/or restricted), including an acknowledgement that balancing diverse uses would be necessary;
- There was a dearth of information to impart at the early stage of the planning process;
- Participation across the state was sporadic, with some locations attracting very few participants (except for those in Gloucester, Boston, Woods Hole, Salem and New Bedford, where attendance was highest).

Other Public Involvement Techniques: EEA and MOP used several Internet-based tools to increase the reach of the stakeholder and public involvement efforts. These included:

- EEA's Listserv which was very useful in directing information to interested groups. Improvements in the advance notice of meetings might increase the effectiveness of this tool and encourage additional public participation.
- EEA and MOP Websites: These mechanisms provided timely access to pertinent information and supporting media (meeting videos and text summaries, schedules, etc.). The MOP website supplemented EEA's web presence with additional tools unavailable to EEA (webcasting video feeds, etc.). These Internet-based outreach tools magnified the reach of stakeholder events by allowing access in real time and after the event and creating an archive for process documentation.

END.

APPENDIX

This appendix provides additional information on the primary stakeholder communication/interaction vehicles used by the Massachusetts Executive Office of Environmental Affairs (EEA), data on stakeholder participation, specific participant comments and summaries of key issues raised. Stakeholder communication/interaction in the ocean management planning process involved several forums and vehicles including, in chronological order:

I. Eighteen public listening sessions conducted across the state (during the fall off 2008)
II. Sixty-six interviews with stakeholder groups (during the fall of 2008)
III. Two stakeholder workshops designed to present and explore the data available for MA ocean management planning (held on Cape Cod and in Boston in February 2009)
IV. Two Ocean Advisory Committee meetings with invited stakeholder participation where ocean data overlays and ocean use compatibility were discussed (held on Cape Cod and in Boston in May 2009)

I. PUBLIC LISTENING SESSIONS

A. Overview

From September 18-October 30, 2008 the Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA) led eighteen public listening sessions in communities across the state. The goals of the sessions were to inform the public about the 2008 Massachusetts Oceans Act (Oceans Act) and solicit public input on the development of the Massachusetts Ocean Management Plan (the Plan) as was mandated by Oceans Act.

At the listening sessions, EEA gave participants an overview of the Oceans Act and the process for developing the Plan. Representatives from the Ocean Advisory Commission (OAC) attended most of the listening sessions and encouraged participants to comment on the goals they would like to see accomplished through the Plan. Videos and transcripts of all listening sessions were made available to the public via support from the Massachusetts Ocean Partnership (MOP) and can be found on the EEA MA Ocean Plan Public Input Portal and MOP's website.[3] A summary report on the listening sessions was prepared by the Consensus Building Institute and can also be found on MOP's website.[4]

B. Stakeholder Participation

In total, nearly three hundred people participated in listening sessions which were held in: Boston, Eastham, Fall River, Gloucester, Lowell, Nantucket, New Bedford, Norwell, Oak Bluffs, Pittsfield, Plymouth, Salem, Salisbury, Springfield, West Barnstable, Weymouth, Woods Hole, and Worcester. Participants self-identified as unaffiliated citizens or representatives affiliated with environmental and community organizations, research and academic institutions, the fishing industry, the recreation/tourism industry, government agencies, commissions or local boards, the energy industry, and business owners.

Table 1: Number of Participants at Listening Sessions (from sign-in sheets)

1-10	*10-20*	*20-30*	*30-40*	*40-50*	*50-60*
• Norwell • Fall River • Lowell • Pittsfield • Springfield • Weymouth • Worcester	• Martha's Vineyard • Plymouth • Salisbury • West Barnstable	• Eastham • New Bedford • Salem • Nantucket	• Gloucester • Woods Hole		• Boston

[3] *http://www.mass.gov and http://www.massoceanpartnership.org/library.html*
[4] http://www.massoceanpartnership.org/library#pls

Table 2: Total Stakeholder Representation at Eighteen Listening Sessions (from sign-in sheets)

Stakeholder Group	***Total number***
Citizen/Unaffiliated	110-120
Environmental & Community Organizations	50-60
Research& Academic Institutions	10-20
Fishing Industry	10-20
Recreation Industry	1-10
Government (state or local)	50-60
Energy Industry	10-20
Business Owner	1-10
Other	10-20

C. Stakeholder Input

Components of a Useful Integrated Plan: Meeting participants offered comments on issues of importance to them that they felt should be reflected in the Plan. While many comments cut across several issues (such as fishing as both an economic and a species preservation issue), comments fell into eight broad categories:

1) Economy,
2) Energy[5],
3) Species and Habitats,
4) Navigational Safety,
5) Public Trust,
6) Research Uses,
7) Hazards, and
8) Other Uses.

1) Economy

The use of the ocean for economic benefits was raised in all listening sessions. Speakers expressed general support for using the ocean to create jobs and economic benefits for local communities. Several noted that the Plan should place a priority on economic uses that do not adversely impact ocean ecology and critical habitat. Others commented that economic development generated by ocean uses should not interfere with public use of the resource. Specific suggestions and ideas included:

- *Aquaculture:* Speakers in several sessions raised the issue of offshore aquaculture. They suggested identifying areas where aquaculture facilities could be developed, with sufficient environmental protections.
    - Identify areas for demonstration farms, large and small scale operations, and shellfish aquaculture
- *Fishing Industry*: Speakers in many sessions commented on the state of the local fishing economy and emphasized the need to protect traditional ocean-based industries.
    - Protect fish and shellfish habitats from negative impacts caused by competing uses including transportation corridors and energy development
    - Map and protect important fishing resources (see Issue 3, Species and Habitats)
- *Shipping*: Some speakers suggested maintaining appropriate areas for shipping lanes.

[5] *While the use of the ocean for energy development is also an economic use, comments related to energy are presented in a separate category*

    - Preserve and increase lanes for short-sea shipping and public transportation (commuter and tourist boats)
    - Identification of shipping lanes should be regionally focused and coordinated
- *Tourism*: Some speakers suggested prioritizing uses that promote tourism, including boat transportation corridors and sightseeing (including whale watches, fishing trips, wind farms).

2) Energy

Alternative Energy - The use of the ocean for alternative energy, specifically offshore wind energy, was raised in all listening sessions. Participants in some sessions mentioned tidal and wave energy development. Most speakers expressed general support for identifying areas that are "appropriate" for offshore wind development. Specific suggestions and ideas included:

- *Appropriate Siting*: Many voiced the need for identifying and mapping areas that are "appropriate" for wind development. Suggested criteria for "appropriate" included:
    - Does not cause harm to endangered, unique, threatened species or habitat
    - Does not cause adverse economic impacts to local industries, including tourism, fishing recreation, and transportation
    - Provides cost effective and profitable energy generation opportunities (is scalable)
    - Provides benefits to local communities, such as energy self-sufficiency, job creation, new fishing habitat, and income sources
    - Is located in federal waters only
- *Prioritizing Uses*: Some felt that wind development should be designated a "priority use" of the ocean.
- *Viewshed Protection:* Some felt that there should be areas that are designated "off-limits" to wind development due to viewshed impacts.
    - Nantucket, Cape Cod National Seashore, and the Salisbury Beach area were mentioned.
- *Community Collaboration*: Some felt that the Plan should include requirements for collaboration between wind developers with other community stakeholders, including municipal officials and fishing communities so that there is sufficient public input and shared benefits are realized.
- *Scalable Opportunities*: Zone for scalable, large-scale wind development, in the appropriate areas, so that wind production can be profitable and efficient.
- *Buffer Zones*: Do not assume no-fishing buffer zones are necessary around wind turbines. There is often good fishing around turbine structures.
- *Wind Turbine Life Cycle*: Adopt measures to ensure that the end life of wind turbines will be handled appropriately.
- *Risk Assessment Requirements*: Require energy development projects to undergo the highest level of risk assessment possible, or least as high as is required for on-shore development projects.
- *Streamlined Permitting*: Provide a streamlined state approval and permitting process for wind development if it meets the requirements presented in the Plan.
- *Research and Pilot Projects*: Zone for smaller-scale energy pilots and installations, such as tidal energy or hydroelectric.

Other Energy Sources: Speakers in several sessions commented on ocean uses for other forms of energy. Specific suggestions and ideas included:

- *Natural Gas*: Zone for LNG terminals and shipping routes.

- *Trade-offs*: Increased wind development should be accompanied by reductions in oil transportation in regional waters.

3) Species and Habitats

Species and habitat management and protection issues were raised at all listening sessions. Speakers suggested that the Plan include consideration and protection of sensitive, unique, threatened species and habitats, as well as species of economic importance. Specific suggestions and ideas included:

- *Ecosystem-based Approach*: Many suggested an ecosystem-based approach to developing the Plan.
- *Habitat Zoning-*: Several suggested zoning that protects sensitive, unique, threatened species and their habitats.
- *Habitat Restoration and Creation*: Several suggested identifying areas for habitat restoration to support ecological diversity, recreational, and commercial uses.
- *Access to Information*: Some suggested development of a public database with information on species numbers, locations, changing conditions, etc.
- *Birds*: Several suggested protecting critical bird habitat from ocean development, including offshore wind.
    - Protect areas that migratory shore birds use for foraging, etc.
- *Fisheries*: Many suggested identifying and protecting critical fish habitat from ocean development, including offshore wind, mining, pipelines, recreation, waste discharge, and potential damage from spills or accidents. Species mentioned included lobsters, shellfish and ground fish
- *Marine Mammals:* Many suggested that whale habitats be protected by limiting transportation and offshore development.
- *Biodiversity*: Develop targets for biodiversity preservation and ensure benthic and biotic habitat diversity.
- *Tidal Circulation*: Identify and protect tidal circulation waters.
- *Water Quality Safeguards*: Adopt and enforce use-specific water quality standards for ocean uses, such as wind development, transportation, waste disposal, etc.

4) Navigational Safety

Navigational safety issues were raised in a couple of listening sessions. Speakers identified a need to update navigational safety considerations as new ocean uses are permitted. Specific suggestions and ideas included:

- *Wind Turbines*: Include safety standards for areas around wind installations – both pre-and post-construction.
- *Shipping Route*: Consider navigational safety issues related to transportation and shipping lanes, including oil and natural gas shipping routes.
- *Ferry Routes: Avoidance* of impacts on ferry routes needs to be considered as plan is developed.

5) Public Trust– Public Use

Issues related to public trust and public uses of the ocean were raised at most listening sessions. Speakers noted that public use of the ocean should not be compromised by private sector endeavors, including energy development, transportation, and research. Specific suggestions and ideas included:

- *Navigational Access*: Several suggested that public rights to navigate and access waterways should be protected:

    - If areas are designated off-limits for recreational navigation, then other areas should be made available for public use.
- *Private Sector Use*: Several expressed concern about private sector use of ocean resources and want measures to:
    - Ensure adequate community input in decision-making on project development
    - Protect public recreational access
    - Protect local fishing industry
    - Protect waters from pollution from offshore developments
    - Protect critical, unique, threatened habitat and species
    - Ensure economic or other benefits to the public from private use
- *Viewsheds*: Some would like to see important viewsheds identified and protected from offshore development.
- *Habitat Creation*: Identify areas for habitat creation programs that will benefit recreational and commercial fishing.

6) Research Uses

Research use issues were raised at a few listening sessions. Most speakers wanted to accommodate ongoing and potential research uses, however some urged that research not harm species, habitats, or local economies. Specific suggestions and ideas included:

- *Future Research*: Allow flexibility for research opportunities that may present themselves in the future, such as exploration for wave energy generation.
- *Green Fleets*: Support research that contributes to the development of renewable resources and best practices for "green" ocean transportation, including fishing and transportation vessels.
- *Species Research*: Develop standards for research capture or take of species for scientific research to ensure that species are not depleted.

7) Hazards

Hazards and hazards mitigation issues were raised in several listening sessions. Speakers supported identifying areas for sand mining and dredging for erosion and storm protection purposes. Specific suggestions and ideas included:

- *Beach Erosion:* Several raised concerns about beach erosion and protection from storm events and their impacts on private property values, recreational use of beaches and beach habitat.
- *Sand Mining and Dredging*: Several proposed identifying sand mining for areas that need beach nourishment.
    - Location of sand mining should be located near areas that need the sand
    - Dredging should not occur in fish habitat areas
- *Ocean Floor Hazards*: Identify areas with ocean floor hazards, such as sunken ships, and adopt standards for removal of hazards.
- *Climate Change:* The Plan should anticipate accommodation for climate change impacts, including impact from rising sea level.

8) Other Uses

Participants raised other issues that should be considered under the Plan. Specific suggestions and ideas included:

- *Ocean Outfall Discharge*: Some participants suggested allowing for ocean outfall discharge, with appropriate standards and oversight.

- *Dredging*: Some participants suggested allowing for dredging in designated areas to manage waste, facilitate shipping, and control erosion.

Approaches to the Planning Process: Many meeting participants offered process suggestions related to the Plan development and implementation. These comments were often broad in scope; however, specific suggestions were offered on:

1) Development of the Plan,
2) Ongoing Implementation, and
3) Regulatory Issues.

Comments reflected a general expectation that the Plan will balance economic, energy, conservation, recreation, and access interests, and will take into account protection of the generally positive quality of life aspects (the ecosystem services) that the ocean provides MA citizens.

1) Development of the Plan

Issues related to the development of the Plan were raised at all listening sessions. Many speakers commented on the need for a scientifically rigorous process, based on sound science and current data. Several stressed using an ecosystem-based management approach, while others emphasized sustaining local economies. Many speakers noted that ongoing public input and outreach to diverse stakeholders was a critical component of plan development. Specific suggestions and ideas included:

- *Ongoing and Additional Stakeholder Engagement*: Many noted that ongoing dialogue with stakeholders and the public is very important. Suggestions for additional outreach included:
    - Conduct additional outreach with residents from Dukes County, Nantucket County, Barnstable County, fishing community, business owners, regional NGOs (Gulf of Maine Council and Rhode Island-based NGOs), local and municipal representatives, and the town of Nahant
    - Publish updates and materials in the *Environmental Monitor*
    - Include a citizen representative on the Ocean Advisory Commission
- *Scientifically Rigorous Approach*: Many commented that the process should be based on sound science and data. Some felt that adequate mapping data, habitat and species evaluation data, and economic impacts data are not currently available and questioned if there would be enough time to generate those data before the deadline.
- *Ecosystem-based*: Several commented that the Plan should be ecosystem-based, indicating that ecosystem well-being should be the first priority and should inform other ocean uses. Some suggested a precautionary approach to ecosystem management.
- *Public need-based:* Some suggested that the Plan be based on public needs, including economic, recreational, and aesthetic (viewshed) ocean needs.
- *Performance Standards*: Develop performance standards for all ocean uses, including energy development, aquaculture, and commercial uses, so that potential project impacts may be evaluated and avoided.
- *Regional Approach*: Develop regional management plans for the Ocean Sanctuary Act regional zones.
    - Include additional focal zones for Buzzards Bay and one for Massachusetts Bay

2) Ongoing Implementation

Speakers in several listening sessions commented on issues related to implementation of the Plan. Specific suggestions and ideas included:

- *Flexibility:* Several noted that the Plan should be flexible enough to incorporate new data and information as it becomes available.
- *Appeals Process*: Need a mechanism for appealing decisions made under the new MA Ocean Plan.
- *Funding*: Solicit corporate subsidies from ocean users to implement the Plan.
- *Decision-making*: Several commented on decision-making and noted that decisions about the Plan should be made in a transparent manner by an impartial body.
- *Public Input and Transparency*: as the Plan evolves, there should be continuous public input and engagement.
    - Public input process should be included in the Five-Year Plan review
- *Research Needs*: Speakers identified data and research topics that should be included in the planning process, including:
    - Aesthetic viewsheds
    - Shellfish and fish habitat
    - Sensitive, unique, and threatened species habitat
    - Fishing grounds
    - Energy/wind facility siting locations
    - Shipping lanes
    - Sand mining locations
    - Seafloor mapping
    - Overlay of offshore resource opportunities and potential conflicting interests
    - System for sharing data gathered in this process with developers, researchers, and the public

3) Regulatory Considerations

Speakers offered comments related to regulatory issues, including permitting for ocean uses, inter-governmental coordination, and the Plan enforcement. Specific suggestions and ideas included:

- *Jurisdictional Coordination*: Several noted the need for coordination between local, regional, state, and federal agencies, noting that each level of government has laws and/or regulations that manage the same resources.
    - Coordinate overlapping regulatory and decision-making processes
    - Coordinate with new MMS regulations on offshore wind development
    - Be consistent with existing local coastal management plans
- *Home Rule*: Several municipal and regional government authorities suggested that the Plan protect local authorities' rights to manage local resources.
- *Federal and State Jurisdiction Impacts*: Several suggested considering how the Plan will impact areas outside of the three-mile zone and visa versa.
    - Address jurisdictional sliver between Stellwagen Bank and state waters
    - Provide coordination for joint state and federal management of Nantucket Sound
    - Consider migratory patterns of species between local, state, and federal waters
    - Consider impacts of development projects in federal waters on state ocean resources.
- *Streamline Permitting and Management*: Some noted that the Plan should promote predictability in the permitting process for ocean uses, including energy and aquaculture, and streamline the process for uses that meet MA Ocean Plan criteria.

    - Consolidate waterways program, DEP oceans sanctuary program, and dam program under one jurisdiction
- *Coordinating Land and Ocean Uses*: Consider how to manage land-based pollution that impacts state waters (such as run off or discharge).

Table 3: Frequency of Categories and Issue Raised at Eighteen Listening Sessions (based on review of listening session transcripts)

High Frequency *(issue raised 10+ times)*	• Alternative energy – wind • Jurisdictional coordination (local, state, and federal) • Protection of unique, sensitive, or threatened species • Protection of local fishing industry interests in access, fisheries protection • Importance of continued citizen engagement and outreach • Ecosystem-based approach to ocean management • Ocean as a public trust resource
Medium Frequency *(issue raised 4-9 times)*	• Utilizing sound science - approach • Aquaculture • Plan adaptability: allowing the flexibility to incorporate novel data on an ongoing basis • Shipping and transportation • Beach erosion control and mitigation • Recreational access and uses • Job creation • Protecting and enhancing biodiversity • Protecting viewsheds • Research uses
Low Frequency *(issue raised a few times)*	• Tourism • LNG transportation • Navigational safety • Ocean outfall discharge • Land based impacts • Habitat creation • Dredging

D. Analysis of Public Listening Sessions

The CBI team attended nine public listening sessions and reviewed transcripts from all eighteen. Based on these experiences and our work on multi-stakeholder engagement and public decision-making processes we offer a few recommendations for the ongoing ocean management planning process.

<u>Public Participation and Representation</u>

In our experience it is not uncommon to have variable participation in public meetings. Participation was, not surprisingly, low in non-coastal communities, including Worcester, Springfield, Pittsfield, and higher in urban and historically active coastal communities, including Boston, Gloucester, and Woods Hole. There was strong participation from fishing industry representatives, state and local government representatives, and both environmental and community organizations.

There was lower participation from recreational user groups and ocean-dependent business groups. Listening session observation revealed that there were very few minority group representatives, youth, and Native American participants in the public listening sessions.

Key Issues

Despite variable attendance at the public listening sessions, several issues were raised with medium and high frequency. It is not surprising that issues that have occupied the media and which attract large constituent interest and/or support such as wind energy, fishing industry and local economy, habitat and species protection, and public access were raised at multiple sessions. The following is a qualitative analysis of where key issues were raised and by whom:

- Speakers that identified themselves as citizens or community group members commented most on wind energy siting. Representatives from environmental organization, fishing industry, and recreational groups also spoke about wind energy.
- Speakers that identified themselves as fisherman and residents in ocean communities including Gloucester, Woods Hole, New Bedford, were most likely to speak about fishing.
- Speakers that identified themselves from environmental organizations or academic institutions were most likely to comment on habitat and species protection. Environmental organizations often sent representatives (or the same representative) to multiple listening sessions.
- Speakers that identified themselves as local government representatives or from regional commissions frequently mentioned jurisdictional coordination, specifically protection of local authority. A range of speakers also raised jurisdictional coordination in the context of offshore wind energy development.
- Protection of public trust and public use of the ocean was raised by a range of participants.

Assessment of issues that were not mentioned frequently - or at all – is also interesting. Infrastructure for traditional energy sources, such as LNG, which has been a highly controversial issue in the past, was not mentioned frequently. Ocean outfall discharge was raised in two sessions; however other waste management issues were not frequently mentioned. Climate change impacts, including sea-level rise, were not raised in public comments.

Key Potential Conflicts

Listening session speakers had a difficult time discussing and/or envisioning trade-offs in ocean uses. Speakers had clear ideas about what they would like to see included (protected/managed/restricted) and they acknowledged that balancing diverse uses would be necessary, however, they did not offer suggestions on how trade-offs might be structured. Based on analysis of the transcripts, potential conflicts or challenges that participants noted include:

- Balancing offshore wind development with fishing, recreational, and environmental uses
- Accommodating sand mining and sufficient habitat protection
- Supporting aquaculture and local fishing economies
- Determining how to address activities just outside of state jurisdiction – in local or federal waters
- Developing shipping and transportation routes without limiting recreational and habitat uses and maintaining public safety
- Incorporating a fisheries management overlay on the Plan
- Adapting to new information and changes to the Plan over time

II. STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

A. Process Overview

Starting in October of 2008 and extending through January 2009, EEA undertook an outreach process, which included individual meetings with representatives of stakeholder groups from all perspectives of the Planning community. The purpose of these interviews was to learn from potentially affected groups about the information they could contribute to the planning process, and to discuss their concerns, hopes, and priority issues for the planning process and the resultant Plan.

B. Stakeholder Participation

Interviewees were selected with the goal of reflecting the full range of views among all constituencies involved in use, protection, and management of resources within the planning area specified in the Oceans Act. The interviewees were selected from the following interest groups/sectors: government entities (local, regional, state, federal, and tribal), users of the ocean resources (including fishing, tourism, energy, navigation, recreation and marine trades) and non-governmental organizations (including marine advocacy and conservation groups, researchers, and watershed protection organizations) and can be found in Table 4. Sixty-six interviews were conducted, involving over 110 individuals; the list of groups interviewed can be found in Table 5.

Table 4: Total Stakeholder Representation at Interviews

Stakeholder Groups Interviewed [6]	
Government Entities	
Local	2
State	3
Regional	5
Federal	11
Tribal	2
Subtotal	*23*
Users of the Ocean Resource	
Fishing	9
Maritime/Security/Transportation/Navigation	9
Energy	2
Tourism/Recreation/Support Industries	6
Subtotal	*26*
Ocean Advocacy & Research Organizations	
Ocean Advocacy	10
Research & Education	4
Environmental Consultants	3
Subtotal	*17*
TOTAL STAKEHOLDER GROUPS INTERVIEWED	**66**
Total Individuals Interviewed	**+110**

[6] Interviewed stakeholder groups were divided into three sectors: Government Entities, Resource Users, and Ocean Advocacy and Researchers. Some groups may fall into more than one group (for example, recreational fishers may also be ocean advocates, and research may be considered a resource use) so this categorization is illustrative rather than quantitative.

Table 5: List of Stakeholder Groups Interviewed [7]

SECTOR	SUBCATEGORY	ORGANIZATION
Government	Local	Massachusetts Harbormasters Association
		Massachusetts Municipal Association
	State	Division of Marine Fisheries
		Massachusetts Aquaculture Association
		New England Army Corps of Engineers
	Regional	Martha's Vineyard Commission
		Nantucket Planning and Economic Development Commission
		Merrimack Valley Planning Commission
		Cape Cod Commission
		Municipal Association Planning Commission
	Tribal	Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe
		Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head
	Federal	Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary
		Cape Cod National Seashore
		Minerals Management Services
		U.S. EPA
		U.S. Fish & Wildlife Services
		Monomoy National Wildlife Refuge
		Mashpee National Wildlife Refuge
		Nomans Land Island National Wildlife Refuge
		Nantucket National Wildlife Refuge
		Parker River National Wildlife Refuge
		NOAA
Ocean Users	Fishing	Massachusetts Striped Bass Association
		Massachusetts Fishermen's Partnership
		Massachusetts Lobstermen Association
		Massachusetts Bay Ground Fishermen's Association
		North Shore fishermen
		Martha's Vineyard Menemsha's Board of Selectmen
		Nantucket fishermen
		Boston Harbor Lobsterman's Assoc.
		Massachusetts Aquaculture Association
	Maritime/Security/Transportation	NE Marine Pilots (including Buzzards Bay)
		Massachusetts Port Authority
		The Seaport Advisory Council
		The Steamship Authority
		Massachusetts Harbor Masters Association

[7] *For purposes of this document, stakeholder organizations are categorized as governmental organizations, "users of ocean resources" and "advocates for conservation of ocean resources and researchers." Under the principles of Ecosystem-Based Management, all conservation and economic activities are considered uses to be integrated and managed (i.e., conservation of larval fish habitat supports other uses such as commercial and recreational fishing).*

		The Boston Harbor Association
		U.S. Coast Guard Massachusetts
		U.S. Coast Guard Rhode Island
		Massachusetts Maritime Academy
	Energy	Patriot Renewables
		Northeast Gas Association
	Tourism/Recreation	7 Seas Whale Watch
		Cape Ann Whale Watch
		Massachusetts Boating and Yacht Clubs Association
		Boston Harbor Cruises
		North Atlantic Dive Expeditions, Inc.
		Massachusetts Marine Trades Association
Ocean Advocacy & Researchers	Ocean Advocacy	Salem Sound Coastwatch
		Mass Ocean Coalition
		The Nature Conservancy
		Coalition for Buzzards Bay
		The Whale Center of New England
		Safer Waters in Massachusetts
		Save the Harbor - Save the Bay
		Nantucket Soundkeeper (Alliance)
		Massachusetts Surfrider Foundation
		Sailors for the Sea
	Research and Education	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute
		School for Marine Science and Technology, UMA Dartmouth
		Provincetown Center for Coastal Studies
		MIT/SeaGrant
	Consultants	ESS Group
		Epsilon Associates
		Durand Anastas

C. Stakeholder Input

In general, stakeholder interviewees were very appreciative of EEA's outreach efforts. Many noted their willingness to continue to work with EEA to produce a useful Plan and to help sort through important issues that will arise during the planning process. Findings from the interviews fall into the following categories:

1) Ocean Issues of Interest,
2) Planning Issues of Interest,
3) Suggestions for the Planning Process (including future stakeholder involvement),
4) Data Source Suggestions, and
5) Potential Benefits of an Integrated Ocean Plan.

1) Ocean Issues of Interest to Stakeholders

The following is the list of *ocean issues of interest* that were raised by stakeholder interviewees *for inclusion in the Plan.* They are listed in rough order of frequency, from the most frequent to the least.

- Alternative energy project siting (wind projects were most frequently cited while tidal energy projects were also mentioned, particularly in the areas around Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket)
    - Defining appropriate scale is important; suggestion that it be defined contextually, depending on the project location
    - Protection of "special viewsheds"
    - Utility cable and transmission line siting guidelines to establish compatibility with other uses
- Protection of unique, sensitive, or threatened species and their habitats
    - Areas for habitat protection, creation, restoration should be identified
    - Whales were mentioned most frequently including threats of impacts from shipping noise on reproduction, and ship strikes for right whales
    - Protection of birds and their habitats
- Protection of local fishing economies and their resources
    - Addressing declining fish stocks and mitigation for loss of income were frequently mentioned
    - Concerns about understanding and addressing the impacts of wind energy developments on access to fishing areas were raised.
- Increasing and preserving tourism and recreational uses
    - Support and preserve coastal communities through protections for fishing, tourism, diving, boating, whale watches, and water quality
    - Protect public access to ocean resources
- Navigation planning should take into account
    - Ferry routes
    - Shipping lanes
    - Oil spill prevention
    - Dredging
- Oil and gas activities
    - Interactions of LNG pipelines and oil transport with other uses
    - Concern about potential impacts on fishing by future removal of the ban on offshore oil drilling
- Jurisdictional coordination between local, regional, state, and federal governmental entities
    - Hopes for a streamlined permitting process that could be created by improved data availability and clarification of allowable uses within specific areas
    - Concern about adding another layer to the existing permitting processes
    - Need for coordination with entities that regulate terrestrial activities that impact the ocean
    - Bring the "donut hole" in Nantucket Sound into state jurisdiction and include in ocean planning area
    - Protect local government authority over ocean uses and incorporate local public opinion about ocean uses
- Water quality considerations
    - Include analysis of impacts in coastal areas from actions in the planning area
    - MWRA discharge area (outfall permit requirements, monitoring)

    - Disposal of dredged sediment
    - Ocean debris management
    - Vessel discharge permits in Nantucket Sound
- Beach erosion and nourishment
    - Identify and plan for sand requirements, source areas and erosion prevention
- Oceans as a public trust
    - Public benefit should be a criteria for permitting development projects
    - The need for mitigation or compensation to address conflicts between private interests and public benefit
    - Mitigation should be directed to affected entities
    - Viewshed preservation is a public interest and should be managed
    - Offshore energy facilities should meet the needs of communities affected by the development to the extent possible
- Include aquaculture siting and permitting in the plan
- Plan for adaptation to sea-level rise and other climate change impacts
- Research uses and exclusions that conflict with other uses
- Security considerations
    - For harbor management
    - LNG transportation
- Historical and cultural interests
    - The eastern horizon is of cultural importance to tribal interests
    - Management of access to underwater archaeological sites
- Address potential development on islands in plan area, especially for wind energy

<u>2) Planning Interests Raised by Stakeholders</u>

The following is the list of *interests regarding the ocean planning process* that were raised by stakeholder interviewees. They are listed in order of frequency, from the most frequent to the least.

- The Plan must be based on science that is reliable enough to allow for solid explanations about specific activities and the locations where they are allowed or restricted.
- Ecosystem-based management principles should be used to designate areas for use or restriction.
- It is essential that the Plan use adaptive management principles to allow for the integration of changing circumstances or new information. The plan needs to have the ability to address emerging ocean issues as they arise.
- Long-term monitoring of the plan, including development of indicators of progress and the capacity for conducting monitoring, is required for a successful Plan.
- The public and user groups need access to quality information that is synthesized and available for planning and implementation.
- Mitigation requirements should be directly related to the affected uses.
- Cumulative impacts assessment and monitoring should be addressed by the plan.
- Data quality concerns and data gaps need to be identified in the plan.
- If two areas are equally suitable/comparable, the Plan should select an area for development that least conflicts with a competing public use.
- The timetable for plan completion may be too tight to result in good decisions about uses, and EEA resources may not be sufficient for the magnitude of the planning task.
- Identify a lead entity/agency for plan implementation

- Use a precautionary approach in the face of uncertainties. That is, err on the side of caution in the face of incomplete data.

Table 6. Frequency of Categories and Issues Raised by Interviewees (from review of interview notes)

	Government Entities	**Ocean Users**	**Ocean Advocacy & Research**
Raised by Many Stakeholders within Sector [8]	• *Alternative energy project siting* • *Protection of unique, sensitive, or threatened species & their habitats* • *Jurisdictional coordination* • *Protection of local fishing economies & their resources*	• *Alternative energy project siting* • *Protection of unique, sensitive, or threatened species & their habitats* • *Jurisdictional coordination* • *Protection & use for tourism & recreation* • *Oceans as a public trust* • *Adaptive management* • *Water quality* • *Navigation planning*	• *Alternative energy project siting* • *Protection of unique, sensitive, or threatened species & their habitats* • *Protection of local fishing economies & their resources* • *Water quality* • *Data gaps & quality*
Raised by Some Stakeholders within Sector	• *Oil & gas activities* • *Beach nourishment & source areas* • *Data gaps & quality* • *Security & public safety* • *Mitigation requirements* • *Adaptive management* • *Protection of cultural resources* • *Water quality*	• *Oil & gas activities* • *Beach nourishment & source areas* • *Data gaps & quality* • *Security & public safety* • *Mitigation requirements* • *Based on reliable science* • *Protection of local fishing economies & their resources*	• *Oil & gas activities* • *Navigation planning* • *Jurisdictional coordination* • *Adaptation to sea-level rise & climate change impacts* • *Based on reliable science* • *Ecosystem-based management principles* • *Timetable*
Raised by a Few Stakeholders within Sector	• *Ecosystem-based management principles* • *Adaptation to sea-level rise & climate change impacts* • *Aquaculture siting* • *Conflict resolution mechanism* • *Long-term monitoring of Plan* • *Cumulative impacts assessment & monitoring* • *Public access to information* • *Protection & use for tourism & recreation* • *Oceans as a public trust* • *Timetable* • *Based on reliable science*	• *Ecosystem-based management principles* • *Adaptation to sea-level rise & other climate change impacts* • *Aquaculture siting* • *Conflict resolution mechanism* • *Take a precautionary approach*	• *Beach nourishment & source areas* • *Adaptive management* • *Mitigation requirements* • *Protection of cultural resources* • *Long-term monitoring of the Plan* • *Cumulative impacts assessment & monitoring* • *Public access to information* • *Protection & use for tourism & recreation* • *Oceans as a public trust*

[8] Many = more than 6 mentions per sector, Some = between 3 and 6 mentions per sector, and Few = less than 3 mentions per sector

3) Planning and Stakeholder Involvement Suggestions

Interviewees also made *suggestions for the ocean planning process.* Specific planning suggestions include:

- Create sub-plans for each MA Ocean Sanctuary area or region.
- Establish criteria for appropriate offshore wind projects, and specify information needed to demonstrate that the criteria are met.
- Build consensus on areas to preserve, then site energy facilities to avoid those areas.
- Develop a specific approach for resolving future use conflicts.
- Link the Plan to implementation of the MA Global Warming Solutions Act and Green Communities Act.
- Steer more to the general in the initial plan and become more specific in successive iterations; be as concise as possible and present information in language the general public can understand.
- Plan could be area-based and informed by ecosystem knowledge.
- Create a plan that will truly work for all interests.

Almost all of the stakeholders expressed a desire for continued stakeholder involvement as the plan evolves, and many suggested that stakeholder discussions take place before the plan is "set in stone." Specific *suggestions for continued stakeholder involvement include*:

- Develop a suite of mechanisms to reach out to various interest groups. For example, approach recreational fisherman on a regional basis, perhaps using tackle shops as vehicles to meet with them and develop a specific outreach strategy and team to liaison with them. Commercial fisherman will benefit from similar tailored outreach, perhaps in regions (North Shore, South Shore, Cape Cod, Buzzards Bay, and Nantucket Sound). Tribal involvement should employ a government-to-government structure.
- Keep all stakeholder groups involved as planning moves forward and then through the implementation years:
    - Keep web sites robust and user friendly; use them to post Fact Sheets, updates, meeting schedules, etc.
    - Develop and disseminate fact sheets, summaries of discussions, and other written documents that allow stakeholders to track progress
    - Develop a listserv and use it to alert stakeholders to upcoming events and new topics on web site
    - Provide opportunities for comment on draft planning principles and documents
    - Convene discussions and meetings that allow consideration of preliminary thinking, plan principles and direction, and draft documents
    - Conduct regional meetings as the plan evolves, and provide sufficient notice for attendees to plan for and prepare for the meetings
    - Be open to continued personal communication with individual stakeholder and government groups
- Use legislative caucuses (e.g. Boating Caucus) as sounding boards

4) Data Sources Identified in Interviews

Many stakeholder groups and public entities contributed data to the EEA data gathering effort through both the internal EEA Work Group process and the stakeholder interview discussions. During the interviews, many stakeholder representatives provided *suggestions about data that can be made available for incorporation into the planning process.* The following list illustrates the range of suggestions, and is not intended to be a comprehensive list.

- Economic Analysis of Mobile Gear Fishing on Horseshoe Shoal, accessible on the web site of the MA Fisherman's Partnership
- Analysis of acoustic data for boat trips in and out of Boston Harbor, gathered by the Stellwagen Bank Marine Sanctuary
- Anecdotal information about current groundfishing areas provided by groundfishers
- Cape Cod National Seashore data base of research permits for use of their waters
- Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound water quality monitoring data for Nantucket Sound (collected over past three years)
- Cape Cod Commission GIS maps for Barnstable County
- MWRA outfall monitoring data
- Environmental Sensitivity maps prepared by MA DEP to be used in oil spill and hazardous materials spill responses
- Ferry route maps available from the US Coast Guard

In addition, some stakeholders made *suggestions for planning frameworks* that they thought were useful. These suggestions included the management plan for the Hawaii National Wildlife Refuge, the Habitat Use Compatibility Framework used by The Nature Conservancy, and management plans developed by the MA Dept. of Conservation and Recreation that identify core uses for specific areas and require buffer zones.

5) Benefits of an Ocean Management Plan

All interviewees were asked about potential benefits that could arise from having a Plan and all but three or four identified a potential benefit. The primary benefits noted can be summarized as: improved regulatory coordination, increased predictability of allowable uses, integration of ecosystem considerations into permitting and regulation, integration planning for uses, resolution of conflicts among uses, and the potential for stakeholder involvement. The following list outlines the potential benefits discussed in the interviews. The Plan could:

- Enhance environmental management coordination
- Establish principles for resource protection, economic development and renewable energy
- Integrate management in state waters with management in federal waters
- Allow rational explanations to the public about decisions concerning encouraged or discouraged uses
- Provide support for new sustainable economic development, including aquaculture and water based transportation
- Clarify needs for mitigation
- Allow the Commonwealth to avoid a case-by-case fragmented approach to project proposals in state waters
- Provide the state with an opportunity to add alternative technologies to the energy portfolio and thereby reduce threats associated with the use of fossil fuels
- Assist regional planning agencies, especially on the Cape and Islands, to plan for and manage their ocean resources

- Minimize conflicts among commercial ocean traffic
- Help address current ambiguities in the MA Ocean Sanctuary regulatory framework
- Provide clarity of what's allowable and what's excluded, which could allow commercial interests to plan accordingly
- Encourage Stakeholder involvement in the planning process and this may help the state make progress toward resolving use conflicts
- Put a marker on the ocean as special, and highlight ocean management issues and the importance of addressing them systematically
- Coordinate and compile data which in and of itself is beneficial; new knowledge will be developed and added to the knowledge base
- Involve the legislature in understanding and acting to address the importance of ocean issues to the state
- Promote Public education which will increase public awareness of ocean management issues.
- Provide for a balance of development and conservation with a mix of uses
- Use Ecosystem Based Management principles to help anticipate and mitigate impacts
- Increase the state's ability to protect habitats, offer predictability for project applicants, and provide targets for monitoring
- Reduce regulatory risk on industry side of projects
- Protect the ocean resource and support our tourism economy
- Set an important precedent for how to do area-based management of the oceans
- Result in a clear identification of research needs
- Identify needs for public financial investments in, for example, data gathering, management, and infrastructure, including dredging
- Potentially improve MA's maritime economy

D. Observations on the Stakeholder Interview Process

Observations on this type of stakeholder outreach include:

- EEA staff responsible for writing the plan were accessible and open to the stakeholder groups;
- The interview process elicited a range of perspectives and thoughtful commentary about the Planning process, management options, and data;
- The EEA planners gained access to a wealth of information that increased the usefulness of the knowledge base for the Plan;
- Process transparency was enhanced;
- Stakeholder groups were educated in some detail about the planning process and the expected product; and
- Stakeholders were educated about their role going forward in the planning process.

In general, the interviews were extremely well-received as an outreach tool, and they established the expectation that EEA would communicate regularly about progress on the plan. The breadth of groups interviewed was very broad, encompassing a wide range of groups with a strong interest in the plan. EEA outreach to specific fishing and recreation groups was key to identifying information sources that increased the reliability of the data base for the plan.

There was considerable discussion of the conflicts that interviewed organizations expected as the plan evolved, and less discussion of ways to address those trade-offs, as is to be expected at the early stages of a planning process. Among the expected use-conflicts noted by interviewees were:

- Fishing and offshore wind energy
- Protected species, fishing and offshore energy facilities

Among the most frequently cited were: alternative energy, protection of unique and sensitive species, and protection of local fishing industries, which were noted as high priority by all groups of interviewees. Jurisdictional coordination was mentioned very frequently by governmental organization and user groups, but was mentioned less frequently by environmental and ocean research groups.

III. STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS FEBRUARY 2009 (BOSTON AND CAPE COD)

A. Process Overview

In February 2009, EEA lead two public workshops, one in Boston and another in Sandwich, MA (Cape Cod). The purposes of the workshops were to: a) provide an explanation of the planning process to date b) present the results of the information gathering work of the six EEA Workgroups c) solicit public input on the ocean management planning process and findings. The two workshops were identical in scope, duration, and content.

At each workshop, EEA updated participants on the ocean management planning process and reviewed milestones and ongoing efforts. A MOP sponsored, multi-organizational research team also presented findings on planning frameworks, tools, and process options from around the world and offered ideas on goals, principles and a conceptual planning framework for the ocean management planning process. Representatives from the six EEA Workgroups (Habitat; Renewable Energy; Fisheries; Sediment Management; Recreation and Culture; Transportation, Navigation and Infrastructure) discussed their efforts to identify all pertinent available data relevant to the process and also significant data gaps. Each presenter used maps to explain their findings to date. Copies of the maps were posted throughout the venue, and workshop participants used an extended break to explore the maps, ask questions, and provide input to presenters on data sources, concerns, and process suggestions.

The workshops were open to the public. EEA reached out to the stakeholders identified in the listening sessions and interviews. MOP also reached out to its partners. The plenary presentation was available live as a webcast to the public over the Internet and archived copies of the webcast, PowerPoint presentations, and maps were also available to the public online via MOP's website.

B. Stakeholder Participation

Over forty stakeholders participated in the Cape Cod workshop (February 7, 2009) and nearly sixty in the Boston workshop (February 10, 2009). Of the approximately 100 participants in the two workshops, nearly half had already participated in the MA Ocean Planning process, either at a listening session or in the stakeholder interview process. Participants self-identified as unaffiliated citizens or representatives affiliated with environmental and community organizations, research and academic institutions, the fishing industry, the recreation/tourism industry, government agencies, commissions or local boards, the energy industry, and business owners.

Table 7: Stakeholder Representation at Cape Cod & Boston Workshops (estimated from sign-in sheets)

Stakeholder Group	***# Cape Cod***	***# Boston***	**Totals**
Citizen/Unaffiliated	*10-15*	*5-10*	**15-20**
Environmental & Community Organizations	*1-5*	*10-15*	**15-20**
Research & Academic Institutions	*5-10*	*5-10*	**10-15**
Fishing Industry	*1-5*	*1-5*	**5-10**
Recreation Industry	*1-5*	*1-5*	**1-5**
Government (state or local)	*5-10*	*10-15*	**20-25**
Energy Industry	*1-5*	*1-5*	**1-5**
Business Owner	*1-5*	*5-10*	**5-10**
Tribal	*1-5*	*0*	**1-5**
Other	*1-5*	*1-5*	**5-10**

C. Stakeholder Input

In general, workshop participants were very appreciative of the outreach to them by EEA. Since most participants were seeing the ocean data and maps for the first time, many of their questions focused on understanding and clarifying the planning process and the data. Workshop participants also offered suggestions for additional data that EEA should try to gather and incorporate into the planning process. Below is a summary of issues raised at the workshops.

Table 8: Summary of Categories and Comments Raised at Workshops (from review of workshop notes)

General Issues Raised	Cape Cod workshop comments	Boston workshop comments
Cultural, historical, and recreational data	How will historical and cultural data be gathered and incorporated?	How will historic and cultural data be gathered and incorporated?
	Importance of protection of Native American historically and spiritually important sites.	Importance of protection of Native American historically and spiritually important sites.
	Importance of viewsheds and the impact of wind development on viewsheds.	Importance of reliable recreational boating data and recreational boating uses.
Areas outside of the MA Ocean Planning zone	Importance of federal-state-local coordination.	Importance of federal-state-local coordination.
	How will the Ocean Plan address land based and near shore impacts?	How will the Ocean Plan address land based and near shore impacts?
	It would be useful to include federal areas in Nantucket Sound into the planning area.	
Fisheries and habitat	How will the Ocean Plan address the temporal component of fisheries and habitat?	How would the Ocean Plan address the temporal component of fisheries and habitat?
	Aquaculture should be included in the Ocean Plan.	Aquaculture should be included in the Ocean Plan.
	Need additional and more accurate fisheries data, including prey species and catchability data.	
Future uses and adaptability	Importance of having the flexibility to manage evolving uses and circumstances.	Importance of having the flexibility to manage evolving uses and circumstances.
		A precautionary approach should be applied because all future scenarios cannot be predicted with current data.
Energy uses	How will "appropriate scale" for wind energy be determined?	How will "appropriate scale" for wind energy be determined?
	The Ocean Plan should accommodate pilot and small-scale energy projects, including tidal.	Energy transmission issues should be considered
Other issues	Ferry routes need to be included in the maps and Ocean Planning process.	Chapter 91; Article 97

D. Observations on the February Stakeholder Workshops

Observations on this type of stakeholder engagement include:

- The Cape Cod and Boston locations allowed good participation with over 100 groups or individuals represented;
- The stakeholders appreciated the multiple venues and the webcasting, as they made the meetings more convenient;
- The information presented helped foster an appreciation for the challenges intrinsic to the planning process while educating stakeholders about the process;
- Informal interaction around the maps allowed stakeholders to gain a more detailed understanding of the data and communicate directly with EEA personnel;
- There were common themes and questions asked at both the Cape Cod and Boston sessions which helped to identify key issues and planning priorities; and
- Although the tight planning time frame reduced the lead-time for announcing the session, many stakeholder groups attended.

Potential drawbacks included the fact that the tight planning time frame reduced the lead-time for announcing the sessions.

Attendance at these workshops varied among groups with fishing, recreational, energy and tribal groups least well represented. Specific targeted outreach to these groups may be a more desirable and necessary involvement approach.

IV. OCEAN ADVISORY COMMISSION MEETING AND STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS MAY 2009 (BOSTON AND CAPE COD)

A. Process Overview

In May 2009, EEA participated in two Ocean Advisory Commission (OAC) meetings that were open to the public; one was held in Boston and another in Woods Hole, MA (Cape Cod). The purposes of the workshops were to: a) present preliminary screening of ocean data that will support MA Ocean Planning goals and strategies b) identify and discuss specific ocean-use compatibilities and incompatibilities c) present and receive input on the conceptual management options. The two workshops were identical in scope, duration, and content.

At each workshop, EEA presented an overview of the process to date and reviewed MA Ocean Planning goals, strategies and projected outcomes. EEA then reviewed select contextual data and the process of using specific data to translate the Oceans Act into a MA Ocean Plan (the Plan). Using a series of maps and overlays, EEA then presented preliminary screening of data on select uses including wind energy, tidal energy, sand resources, pipelines and cables, aquaculture and conceptual options for managing those uses. EEA also presented preliminary screening of data on special, sensitive, and unique species and habitats (SSUs) and conceptual options for managing those SSUs. Throughout the presentations, EEA stressed that data provides insights but does not represent the Plan.

OAC members were encouraged to ask questions and make comments during the presentation. The public was asked to give their comments and questions during a public comment period at end of the workshop. Copies of the maps were posted throughout the venue, and workshop participants used an extended break to explore the maps and ask questions of the presenters.

The workshops were open to the public. In addition, invitations were targeted to previous process participants and known interested stakeholders. The EEA presentation was available live as a webcast to the public over the Internet and copies of the webcasts and presentations were available on MOP's website.

B. Stakeholder Participation

Approximately forty-five stakeholders participated in the Cape Cod workshop (May 2, 2009) and eighty-five in the Boston workshop (May 6, 2009). Of the over 140 participants in the two workshops, over half had already participated the planning process, either at a listening session, in the stakeholder interview process, or at the February stakeholder workshops. Participants self-identified as unaffiliated citizens or representatives affiliated with environmental and community organizations, research and academic institutions, the fishing industry, the recreation/tourism industry, government agencies, commissions or local boards, the energy industry, and business owners.

Table 9: Stakeholder Representation at Cape Cod & Boston Workshops (estimated from sign-in sheets)

Stakeholder Group	***# Cape Cod***	***# Boston***	**Totals**
Citizen/Unaffiliated	*5-10*	*10-15*	**20-25**
Environmental & Community Organizations	*1-5*	*10-15*	**15-20**
Research & Academic Institutions	*5-10*	*5-10*	**15-20**
Fishing Industry	*1-5*	*1-5*	**5-10**
Recreation Industry	*1-5*	*1-5*	**1-5**
Government (state or local)	*10-15*	*15-20*	**25-30**
Energy Industry	*1-5*	*1-5*	**1-5**
Business Owner	*1-5*	*5-10*	**10-15**
Tribal	*1-5*	*1-5*	**1-5**
Other	*1-5*	*1-5*	**5-10**

C. Stakeholder Input

In general, workshop participants were again very appreciative of the outreach to them by EEA and commended EEA and MOP staff for their work gathering, integrating and presenting the data and their current thoughts on management options. The focus of some OAC member and public questions and comments was on understanding and clarifying the data, however more comments were focused on how the data could be used to develop the Plan and directed toward the conceptual management options. Below is a summary of issues raised at the workshops.

Table 10: Summary of Comments Raised at Workshops (from review of workshop notes)

General Issues Raised	**Cape Cod workshop comments**	**Boston workshop comments**
Data gaps	Need additional fisheries data, including fixed gear data for Martha's Vineyard	How to measure impacts and opportunities related to climate change, climate change adaptation and mitigation?
	Importance of cultural and viewshed data. How it will be incorporated into the Plan	Importance of cultural and viewshed data. How it will be incorporated into the Plan
	Ecosystem-based approach to data gathering needed (i.e., common birds are also important to consider in the Plan)	Need data on opportunities for restoring habitat and fisheries.
Areas outside of the Planning area	Importance of federal-state-local coordination.	Importance of federal-state-local coordination.
	Importance of addressing land based and near shore impacts	Importance of addressing land based and near shore impacts
	How will the Ocean Plan address impacts from federal waters, including in the federal area in Nantucket Sound	

Management options and implications	Are there tools to control development "sprawl" in MA oceans?	Are there tools to control development "sprawl" in MA oceans?
	Options for community level decision-making and management	Options for community level decision-making and management, local siting of energy facilities, test projects, and businesses.
	Management implications of new and evolving data (i.e., related to technology improvements, additional science, climate change impacts)	Management implications of new and evolving data (i.e., related to technology improvements, additional science, climate change impacts)
	Management implications of data gaps and the long and short term Ocean Planning process.	Management options for balancing tradeoffs and tensions between uses (i.e., constraints and exclusionary zones)
	Management options for dealing with evolving circumstances, understandings, and technologies	Management options for dealing with evolving circumstances, understandings, and technologies
	What is EEA's current "conservation" approach in this phase of the Ocean Plan?	What is EEA's current "conservation" approach in this phase of the Ocean Plan?
Ongoing Engagement	Continued engagement with Native Americans is important.	Continued engagement with Native Americans is important.
	There are opportunities for engaging younger generations in this process	Continued engagement with the Science Advisory Committee would be useful.
	Local knowledge and resources should be tapped for this process (fisheries, Native American, and local viewshed data)	

D. Observations on the May OAC Meeting and Stakeholder Workshops

Observations of this type of stakeholder involvement included the following elements:

- Significant information exchange;
- Accessible meetings and webcasting;
- Thoughtful discussions of the key management options and their challenges, including some convergence on which management approach might work best;
- Map explanation in small groups allowed some hands-on tailored discussion;
- Relatively little time within the meeting format for significant give and take with stakeholders;
- and
- Participation in these workshops was lowest for the fishing, recreational, energy and tribal groups, repeating the pattern of the February workshops. Given that these workshops were the first to discuss management options, increased participation from these groups was highly desirable.

END.