

NWL meeting May 15, 2024

Deering 101

Introductory remarks to not let 'perfect be the enemy of good' (Tom), moving something forward that is impactful is the goal (JoD), and this work will make a difference in people's lives (Amanda).

Our language should be active and specific. Actions should be presented in thoughtful order, though it's not particularly clear that recommendations should also be in a thoughtful order.

We will do our best to incorporate any comments from today (please have them to JoD by end of next week). There will not be an opportunity for more wordsmithing until this document is at the climate council, and that process gets started June 18. GOPIF will create a coherent document that likely will resort and combine our recommendations where they best fit, versus exactly mimic what NWL group provides them. We don't have a sense of how this information will be used. At a minimum it will inform outreach GOPIF will continue to do over the summer and enable them to consider if more metrics should be added to dashboard to decide how we're doing as a state.

30% Lands Subgroup

The overall common theme in comments was around equity & inclusiveness, have bolstered/amplified some of that language in intro and priorities, clarified funding amounts between farmland/overall conservation lands, and lump sum vs annual funding.

Andy and Adam discussed specifics, additions and revisions as noted in packet.

Andy W feels biodiversity conservation orientation is important to bring to the top, as a lot of the land in discussion is land that is under management as either farmland or forest. Page 6, 2nd paragraph, says a lot, is very vibrant in terms conservation attributes. The economic/rural communities discussion isn't as clear. Andy C-couple pieces to this, the millions of acres of working forest conservation easement critical to climate work and forest economy, other part is outdoor recreation economy, and conserved lands are huge part of that.

Discussion regarding deliverable template noting things that are not fully addressed, even if things hadn't changed. The equity working group felt this was important.

Discussion preamble/overarching language adequately capturing Andy W's concern. Phillip suggested adding 'whenever possible' for bullet 2 (Karin, Pat concurred), but Ches felt 'amongst others' in wording at the end of the list covers this concern and allows for open-endedness. Further discussion noted adding 'whenever possible' to one bullet seems disproportionate.

Andy will add some language to the introduction that we are seeking a balance on each of the three bullets and recognize that we may not achieve all three goals on every piece of land.

Discussion of order of recommendations-Andy is uncomfortable that order of recommendations implies hierarchical priorities. Though funding is the most important of all these recommendations, the existing first recommendation sets the stage for what matters as we accomplish the work in the other recommendations. Final decision is to leave 1 as-is, move farmland to recommendation 2, and shift funding and capacity to 3 and 4 as optics matter and it tells a better story. Introductory comments should note that the recommendations aren't hierarchically ordered.

30% Food Subgroup

Brittany noted there were lots of great comments in meeting and follow up in email to improve specificity recs and equity component and then summarized changes.

Bethany made suggestion to be more specific around 'increasing equitable access to food', what are those programs and what do they need to accomplish this vision? Likes specificity of 3C. If order matters, recommendations become 3B (*I'm unclear about this*). Further discussion of order of recommendations, resulting in C becoming E, D and E then becoming C and D. The footnote in support of what was 3C will go onto what is now 3B.

Craig talked about the need for a strategic plan, and that that process will bring in more community voices and greater participation. Suggested a footnote after 'existing' and 'funding' in 3C that explains numbers.

Forest Carbon Subgroup

Discussed revisions, rewrite to make clear that other states inform but not determine Maine's carbon work. 3G died on appropriations table. Language could be re-introduced as a bill or as part of budget in next session, so we will retain this recommendation in plan. If re-introduced, new language should largely follow old as so much effort went into it.

Discussion re-ordering recommendations. Financial incentives are the biggest priority. Move recommendation 3 to 1 and leave 2 where it is. This tells a better story, and the impactful thing we can do is provide resources for people to do what we're encouraging them to do.

The order of actions should be G, C, A, B, D, E, F.

Template discussion

Discussion subheaders. Based on equity work group, it's important to keep all of them, note where we changed recommendations because of, say, the Mitchell Center study, and flag those areas where we didn't modify anything.

For us to consider this complete, we will need to include all the subheaders and put the 5 subheaders under each subgroup recs. Better to acknowledge where things didn't go as planned and to highlight that here. JoD-most critical piece is implementation question, we should be transparent where we think there are gaps.

Andy C offered a concrete example regarding priority pops and land conservation: Stage Island- looking at co-management of lands w/ Tribes and increasing collaboration around indigenous interests and lands. Most important is implementation to ensure this is in a manner that takes into account and is informed by priority pops.

Karin offered example (at end of mtg) of Mystic River Watershed Association (Julie Wermser) in MA, who is working with lower income communities for SLR and having buffer between land and water and working with these groups. Karin will share weblink or brief write up w/ Andy C.

Possibly add effort to provide childcare and housing to get at sustainability of industry and jobs to have conserved lands in working forest to forest carbon section (Pat S).

Add clarification to 30% food template on page 16, last paragraph part 3 acknowledging limitations-what we did and didn't do according to headers, respond to headers that remain. The way action 1C talks about centering community involvement (youth, priority pops), may already be captured in other three paragraphs. Would be good to flag this if it isn't adequately done.

Page 16, first clause of first sentence should be rephrased to say "priority populations are disproportionately impacted by food insecurity...".

Andy W-rec 1, item 3. Access to tech assistance presupposes you are already part of the food system. The last rec is an access issue. What kind of access are you trying to provide? JoD, asking if Brittany can create distinctions. Flagging this. Revisit this in terms of the 5 categories, particularly in terms of implementation question.

Page 25, forest C, need to add in result of engagement subheader.

Dana, page 27, tech assistance/education deliverable, thinks #5 is duplicative. Page 27, the purple text under implementation about financial incentives/funding. JoD will change to "increased access to technical assistance", so that simpler language matches 2. There was agreement about this-with tech assistance, people can be informed about incentives and opportunities.

Dana, page 29, similar section priority pops, the purple text, doesn't understand how developing training materials leads to financial incentives. JoD will rework to be consistent with recommendation.

Val Watson, to Karin's point about land conservation/infrastructure/natural climate solutions, many people find permitting and other barriers in the way. Maybe community resilience should address this issue, but it might be worth calling out to use land conservation to do natural climate solutions projects or highlighting projects that are opportunities for co-management w/ Wabanaki nations (and be sure to note this is govt to govt interaction).

Alison, food section. Intro, 3rd paragraph, this paragraph should clearly articulate the need to develop a definition in regard to the state level food plan, use that to wrap up assessment current state status and to inform food plan. (That's noted somewhere, 1D). Alison, can we carry over some of that language into the intro because it's been missed previously.

Template section cross over #2, (page 16?) waste management working group, should be materials management task force.

First topic for food recs (page 18-bottom page 17?) under food plan metrics, rephrase to 'scoring criteria' or 'internal review committee', something that gives a little bit of directionality.

Comments to JoD by May 24

GOPIF meeting June 18!