



Maine Woods Consortium Coordinating Team Conference Call Notes, 6/4/09

Participants: Keith Bisson, Coastal Enterprises, Inc; Mike Eisensmith, Northern Maine Development Commission; Mary Ann Hayes and Lucas Sanders, Maine Rural Partners; Bruce Hazard and Shaunacy Cobb, Mountain Counties Heritage; Dina Jackson, Androscoggin Valley Council of Governments; Carolann Ouellette, Maine Office of Tourism; Andy Whitman, Manomet Center for Conservation Sciences; and Robin Zinchuk, Bethel Area Chamber of Commerce.

Individual To Do List

® **Mary Ann Hayes**

1. Rework Community Revitalization outcomes.

® **Bruce Hazard**

1. Pull together information on CEI, Manomet, and MeCEP's projects that could serve as a possible EDA match.
2. Recruit chair for next meeting.
3. Organize meeting for indicators and strategies.

® **Dina Jackson**

1. Email out EDA application to group.
2. Follow up with Andy on regional sustainability and resilience to disaster.

® **Carolann Ouellette**

1. Schedule DECD room for October 1 meeting.

Next Meeting

Conference call - Thursday, August 6 from 9-11am

Meeting Notes

EDA Funding. Dina reported that the application for EDA Disaster Relief Funding is almost ready to go. Right now, AVCOG is missing match letters from EMDC and KVCOG. Since KVCOG is a small organization with a limited funding pool, they may not be able to commit the match. Dina is not sure if EMDC can commit to it either. Mountain Counties Heritage cannot fill the approximately \$38,000 gap. Bruce and Dina are exploring other options. Bruce identified projects that members of the Consortium are working on that are aligned with MWC activities funding for which could be used as match. Maine Center for Economic Policy is doing a study on amenity based development (David Vail study); MeCEP would be willing to let us use funding for that project as match. CEI and Manomet made similar offers. Since the application is for money to develop the structure and capacity and not program implementation, Bob Thompson and Dina are working on the language to incorporate these additional activities and sources of support.

Andy suggested looking at the “disaster relief” through the lens of regional sustainability, framing MWC program as working towards resilience to disaster. Dina will follow-up with him on this line of thought.

Mary Ann asked Dina to email out the draft application since the group has not seen it since last year. It would be easier for everyone to think about what other match options are out there after reading the application’s language. Dina will email it out next week. The match must be non-federal money and preferably not an in-kind match. Time committed by EDD staff is considered a cash match.

Bruce asked if AVCOG still has the capacity to get the application done. Dina feels that AVCOG’s personnel has the experience assembling these applications. Mike Eisensmith thought that it is important to have continuity in their discussions with Alan Brigham.

Outcomes. A small group (Dina, Bruce, Garrett Martin, Andy, and Mary Ann - via phone) met to narrow down outcomes to 2 per program area.

Per notes from that meeting, outcomes proposed were as follows:

- Landscape Resources outcomes (DRAFT)
 1. Healthy ecosystems with landscape retaining traditional character (working forests and farmlands, hunting and fishing, trail recreation, and remote uses)
 2. Multiple sustainable uses of landscapes and their ecosystem services (wood products, food, drinking water, diverse recreational opportunities, etc.) by individuals, businesses, and organizations that support local communities.
- Community Revitalization outcomes (DRAFT)
 1. Social assets are conserved and enhanced (healthy social and civic systems) (and being used?) to create a vibrant economy and community life.
 2. Physical assets are conserved and enhanced (and being used?) to create a vibrant economy and community life.
- Networked Economies outcomes (DRAFT)
 1. Economic systems and community culture support asset-based, networked entrepreneurial activity. (systems level)
 2. Successful and innovative asset-based enterprises (entrepreneur level).
- Cross outcomes (DRAFT)
 1. Local input incorporated into planning and decisions impacting their landscape, economy, and community.
 - 2, Increased social capital through the transmission of knowledge and skills.

Mary Ann had proposed as an alternative for Community Revitalization:

- Community Revitalization outcomes (DRAFT of 6/2)
 1. Widespread engagement (at least 20% of community members are actively engaged) in recognizing, enhancing and strategically mobilizing social, physical and economic assets toward agreed-upon revitalization goals (can document through process records, surveys and published strategic plans).

2. MW region population grows (at least 5% in 10 years? Need help here) and median age is reduced to the State median (can document through published data).

Mary Ann is trying to connect the outcomes for Community Revitalization with how they be measured while focusing in on MWC's niche. She felt that it did not make sense to separate the physical assets from the social assets so she combined them. Mike Eisensmith appreciated her approach to formulating the outcomes but felt that the language of it should be less of a view behind the curtain. Mary Ann agreed to rework the outcomes to have one focus on the condition of the assets and another focus on the sustainable use of the assets (similar to Landscape Resources).

The Networked Economies outcomes are split into one focusing on system level outcomes and another on the entrepreneurial level. MWC's niche seems to be at systems level. Mary Ann thought that the two outcomes could be combined. The group did support whittling it down to one outcome.

A subgroup will look at indicators (anyone who wants to participate can) and specific strategies. Dina suggested that the team revisit the reason for being paragraph to reflect the outcomes.

Information Management. Mary Ann and Lucas gave a quick update to the group on the system. They have been exploring commercial software packages that may meet MWC's needs. Lucas recommended CCAMP at a meeting of Bruce, Mary Ann, and Shaunacy. The group was initially tempted to go with CCAMP because it is a fully supported system but when they started discussing how the system would be used, the group felt that it was too rigid. Expression Engine allows more flexibility and Lucas can customize it for the groups needs. Further down the road, the group will have to decide if Expression Engine should replace the current website run by Joomla or be programmed to work with the existing site. Lucas is staying around another year and plans to devote the month of August to this project. He is still looking for a peer review person since FairPoint has pulled back support. He is putting together a cost proposal.

Funding Sources. The group was not invited to submit a full proposal to the Environmental Funders Network.

Structure. Going forward, Mountain Counties Heritage will continue to provide meeting support (notes, coordination) but Coordinating Team members will be asked to take turns facilitating the meetings. The group needs a chair for the next meeting.