



## **Engaging stakeholders in community-based conservation: Findings from Downeast Maine and the Bay of Fundy**

Marisa Arpels and Allison Lassiter

MIT-USGS Science Impact Collaborative  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Cambridge, Massachusetts

September 2008

Researchers and faculty of the MIT-USGS Science Impact Collaborative (MUSIC) prepared this report for the authors and MUSIC. The contents of this report do not imply endorsement or commitment to any recommendations and proposed actions by MIT or the agency for which it was prepared. This report is a draft and should not be cited, quoted or distributed without written permission of MUSIC.

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	2
<b>Background</b> .....	5
<b>Findings</b> .....	7
Section 1: Community Participation.....	7
Who is involved? .....	7
How are they involved? .....	8
Who is not involved? .....	10
Section 2: Cultivating Community Involvement .....	12
Building trust .....	12
Managing conflict .....	16
Section 3: Working with Fishermen .....	19
Why fishermen are difficult to engage .....	19
Ways to engage fishermen.....	20
Ways to make meetings with fishermen more effective.....	22
Section 4: Working with Others in the Community .....	25
Local kids .....	25
Scientists.....	25
Concerned citizens.....	26
Multi-stakeholder groups.....	26
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	28
<b>Appendix A</b> .....	32
<b>Appendix B</b> .....	34

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

In 2006, MIT-USGS Science Impact Collaborative (MUSIC) began a partnership with QLF/Atlantic Center for the Environment and Ecological Policy Design, called the Nearshore Ecosystem Collaborative. Their goal is to produce a replicable, community and science-based process for learning how discrete nearshore systems function in Maine. This process is being piloted in Muscongus Bay.

Community-based approaches to ecosystem management attempt to address conservation and development simultaneously, in order to build long-term and inclusive conservation strategies. Organizations that use this approach face unique challenges in bringing together local stakeholders and reconciling differing social and ecological objectives. The purpose of this report is to document lessons learned from leading collaborative conservation organizations in marine and terrestrial ecosystems near Muscongus Bay. We interviewed eight key individuals from six organizations located in Downeast Maine and the Bay of Fundy, Canada.

This report is intended to capture the thoughts and ideas of those interviewed in order to offer a synthesis of the approaches, challenges and views of success by those working on community-based ecosystem management. We view this exercise as a process of shared organizational learning, creating a picture of what efforts are occurring on the ground and looking for cross-linkages between approaches.

We chose to focus our research solely on organizations in order to gain a better understanding of the internal dynamics of how these groups operate within the community. For this reason, the findings in the report tend to focus on process rather than outcomes. Moreover, they cannot be said to reflect the opinions of the communities, but rather highlight internal reflection of these organizational leaders.

### **Summary of Key Findings**

Our findings can be broken up into three general categories: scope of community involvement; cultivating community involvement and managing conflict; techniques of engaging fishermen and multiple stakeholder groups.

#### **I. Scope of community involvement**

This section describes the types of stakeholders involved with each organization and how they interact with the organization. In general, stakeholders played a number of different roles, ranging from direct participation in the organization's management to outside support. Although some organizations had an inclusive view of memberships, others chose to focus primarily on one resource user

group. All the organizations highlighted the difficulties of attracting certain groups of stakeholders due to suspicion or apathy.

## **II. Cultivating community involvement and managing conflict**

Interviewees described a number of challenges in fostering community involvement, stimulating engagement and managing conflict. Building trust and empowering stakeholder groups were the central activities conducted by each organization. Dedicating staff time to listening and building relationships in the community, showing incremental success through small milestones, maintaining neutrality, and recognizing the slow rate of progress were all cited as critical components to engaging the community.

In addition, all organizations played a major role in managing conflict in the community. Techniques included special attention to meeting locations and settings, fostering unifying perspectives and a common identity, and creating separate opportunities for different interest groups. Several organizations played a consensus-building role between different stakeholder groups, functioning as an intermediary to broker inter-constituency learning and create formal agreements between different stakeholder groups. Others functioned as advocacy organizations.

## **III. Techniques of engaging fishermen and multiple stakeholder groups**

Sections 3 and 4 highlight targeted approaches to engaging fishermen and other primary stakeholders. Fishermen are particularly difficult to involve in organizational activities due to the social, cultural, and economic norms associated with fishing culture. Grassroots organizing through existing social networks, informal conversations, and culturally sensitive scheduling appear to be critical in the slow process of engaging fishermen. In addition, all five marine organizations offered formal or informal training to build leadership and managerial skills within the local fishing community. Four of the five organizations encouraged local users to organize and form independent advocacy groups, which could then help lobby and develop action-oriented projects tailored to their interests. All six of the organizations discussed bringing different stakeholders together in venues such as education seminars, science-roundtables, voluntary opportunities, and learning roundtables.

### **Next steps**

This report highlights the commonalities and differences between each organization's approach to stimulating community involvement around natural resource issues in nearshore ecosystems. Based on our findings, we offer the following recommendations for the Nearshore Ecosystem Collaborative in

beginning to develop a replicable model for collaborative, community-based conservation in Muscongus Bay:

- 
- Identify major stakeholder groups in the Muscongus Bay area
  - Begin conversations with individuals or groups currently working in the area in order to identify their interests and concerns
  - Map interests and communities in order to develop an understanding of potential areas of conflict, synergies, and ways to reconcile short and long-term goals
  - Organize roundtable discussions with individual user groups to build consensus among users about common interests
  - Create a set of principles or goals in collaboration with these groups to help guide future decision-making
-

## BACKGROUND

---

In 2006, the MIT-USGS Science Impact Collaborative (MUSIC) began a partnership with QLF/Atlantic Center for the Environment (QLF) and Ecological Policy Design (EPD) to promote collaborative conservation of nearshore ecosystems. The goal of the partnership, called the Nearshore Ecosystem Collaborative, is to identify and test new ways of incorporating science in environmental decision-making. Muscongus Bay, Maine currently serves as the test location in creating a replicable methodology for collaborative conservation.

As a first step, Jennifer Atkinson of QLF, Charles Curtin of EPD, and MUSIC interns developed an interview survey to research lessons learned from several other community-based conservation groups in Downeast Maine and the Bay of Fundy, Canada. MUSIC interns were tasked with interviewing four individuals who worked with organizations known to have successfully engaged local users in resource-based activities. Two of the four individuals worked with marine-based organizations in Maine, one worked with marine-based organizations in Nova Scotia and another worked with a terrestrial-based organization in Maine. The terrestrial and Canadian organizations were specifically selected to provide insights on the differences and similarities of their approaches in comparison to Maine's marine-based groups.

After the first round of interviews, each of the four individuals suggested two of their co-workers or colleagues to be interviewed. The goal was to speak to three people who worked with the same organization in different capacities, so as to gain a multi-faceted understanding of the organization's approach.

All interviews were conducted from December 2007 to February 2008. In practice, it was difficult to schedule time with several of the people recommended for the second round of interviews. Only four of the eight secondary interviews were completed. Individuals were contacted an average four times through phone calls and emails. Due to the lack of response, we discontinued further attempts to schedule an interview. Following is a list of the people interviewed and the organization they worked for (see Appendix A for more information on the organizations).

NAME	ORGANIZATION
Robin Alden*	Penobscot East Resource Center
Ted Hoskins	Penobscot East Resource Center
Will Hopkins*	Cobscook Bay Resource Center
Heidi Leighton	Cobscook Bay Resource Center
Chris Bartlett	Cobscook Bay Resource Center
Maria Recchia*	Fundy North Fisherman's Association, Costal Livelihoods Trust
Arthur Bull	Bay of Fundy Marine Resource Center
Mark Berry*	Downeast Lakes Land Trust

\* First round interviewees

Note that the Maria Recchia and Arthur Bull, the Canadian interviewees, were interviewed on their work with a total of three different organizations, not one single organization. As a result, there were a total of eight interviewees discussing six organizations.

Interviews were semi-structured around a list of questions available in Appendix B. The questions focused on methods of engaging resource users in the organization and reflections on best practices and lessons learned from these activities. MUSIC interns spent approximately one hour talking to each interviewee. MIT's Committee on the Use of Humans as Experimental Subjects (COUHES) evaluated and approved the questionnaire and study formula. Interviewees were all asked to sign a consent form as per COUHES's protocol for human research. In addition, each interviewee was told that they could review the contents of this report.

The following is intended to capture the thoughts and experiences of those interviewees, so as to guide future practices for community-based nearshore ecosystem management in Maine. This is not an exhaustive coverage of the issues facing the people involved with each organization; rather, it is a snapshot of the similarities and differences in organizational approaches to community engagement.

## **FINDINGS**

---

### **SECTION 1: COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION**

Each one of the groups interviewed interacted with multiple stakeholders in different capacities. Each had a principal resource user group they either represented or worked with, but also engaged with other groups, such as scientists, municipal officials, and public schools. Most organizations, however, reported that there were some sectors of the community that were difficult to engage due to communication obstacles or individual attitudes.

#### **1.1 Who is involved?**

All organizations engaged with several stakeholder groups, though some were more committed to expanding their stakeholder base than others. For example, Cobscook Bay Resource Center actively supports projects with approximately 12 different stakeholder groups, while organizations like Penobscot Bay Resource Center intentionally focuses strongly on commercial fishermen. Nonetheless, every organization has one user group that was the basis of its motivation for forming, which is identified in the table below as the organization's principal stakeholder group:

	Commercial fisherman	Commercial clammers	Loggers	Logging companies	Aquaculturists	Tourboat Operators	Recreation-based guides	Liquified Natural Gas companies	Tidal power companies	Biologists or Naturalists	Tribal members	University extension programs	Public Schools (K-12)	Craftsmen	Recreational fishermen	Snowmobilers	Trappers	Birders	Second home owners	Tourists	Government officials	Funding organizations
Bay of Fundy Resource Center	●									●	●		●		●						●	●
Coastal Livelihoods Trust	●				●	●				●	●		●							●		●
Cobscook Bay Resource Center	●	●			●			●	●	●	●	●	●					●	●		●	●
Downeast Lakes Land Trust			●	●			●			●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Fundy North Fisherman's Association	●									●		●									●	●
Penobscot East Resource Center	●	●								●			●								●	●

● Principal stakeholder group    ● Other stakeholder group

## 1.2 How are they involved?

Resource users were involved in a number of competencies, ranging from organizational capacities, to long-term project-based activities, to short term informational services.

### 1.2.1 As part of the organizational leadership

#### a. Board of Directors

Most of the organizations emphasized and re-emphasized the importance of the Board of Directors. As Chris Bartlett said, “The strength of the organization revolves around the strength of the board.” Almost everyone also underscored how much work is involved in being on a board.

Five of the eight interviewees believed that boards are the most important method of representing different communities within an organization. The method of representation varied between organizations. While organizations such as Downeast Lakes Land Trust assume that a board member implicitly speaks on behalf of his or her community, in Fundy North, every board member is formally assigned to represent a specific community and “if they don’t feel comfortable representing their community on a particular issue, they must go back and talk with their community.” In contrast, Bay of Fundy Resource Center holds seats on its board for representatives from different constituent organizations (e.g. the Fishermen’s Association). If the constituency does not fill the seat, they are not represented on the board. In general, every organization hopes to have each of its major stakeholder groups represented (e.g. a person for every species and every town).

Board appointments may be for a pre-defined period of time or may be indefinite. Those with finite terms allow for re-election. Several interviewees noted that the board members tend to burn out after a few years. This is a particular challenge for organizations with a smaller number of constituents, such as Downeast Lakes Land Trust, whose board has primarily come from the 150 person community of Grand Lake Stream, though they have always included some board members from nearby towns. While this is in part because there is a desire to incorporate more stakeholders in the board, it is also because of the limited resources within the town.

Even in areas with larger constituencies, however, exhausting the pool of potential board members may prove to be a challenge. Chris Bartlett provided some guidelines on building a successful and enduring board:

- Establish early on if your organization is going to be an advocacy group.
- Beyond the bylaws, explicate your organization’s core principles.
- Administration and structure are tedious, but allow the organization to accomplish exciting things.
- In order to retain board members, do fun activities together. Get to know one another on a personal level.

### ***b. Board Committees***

Some organizations have created a second tier of formal involvement through committees. At Downeast Lakes Land Trust, committees play a critical role in the administrative functioning of the forest; they are responsible for tasks such as financial management and board selection. In most of the other organizations, committees are formed to work on specific projects, to organize events, or as forums to discuss issues related to specific topics, such as aquaculture. Maria Recchia noted that some committees are more active than others. “If there’s no pressing issue a committee doesn’t organize well. People aren’t meeting just to meet. Most will only come with threat to their livelihood.”

### **1.2.2 As project participants**

In addition to ongoing committee meetings, each organization also worked on specific projects. The projects ranged from one time events, such as water quality monitoring or legislative testimonies trips, to ongoing activities, such as fisherman committees or lobster hatcheries. Most of the projects are based on stakeholder input, elicited from conversations with individuals or group meetings. In some cases, however, they were developed out of a perceived need by the organization. Nonetheless, two of the interviewees emphasized that demand-driven projects typically work better.

In addition, social gatherings were common to all of the organizations. These included lectures, drives, raffles, dinners and church meetings. Various interviewees emphasized having an annual or biannual social gathering to get people to know each other and talk informally.

### **1.2.3 As project supporters, recipients, audience**

All of the organizations interviewed functioned in an educational capacity, whether through official school groups or as information distributors. Several organizations also offered workshops, classes, resources, or media. Penobscot East Resource Center, for example, mails out a quarterly newsletter on their projects and progress. Cobscook Bay Resource Center acts as an information clearinghouse for tidal power, so that local residents walk in to their offices and learn more about the tidal power pressures that face the bay.

## **1.3 Who is not involved?**

While all organizations reported strong community involvement and support, five of the six reported that there are some groups of individuals that are difficult to engage. In contrast, the remaining organization, Downeast Lakes Land Trust, believes that almost everyone in their community is either directly or indirectly represented due to their organizational structure of a rotating board and committees. It seems that issues relating to representation may be more problematic in areas which are more populous or more geographically expansive than Grand Lake Stream. In larger areas with looser social networks, it is more difficult to ensure that all members of the community are represented.

### **1.3.1 People who are difficult to contact**

Some organizations, such as Fundy North, rely heavily on communication with constituents through mailings sent to permitted resource users. The difficulty in this method of communication is that in fishing boats, only the captain is

permitted. The crew, therefore, may not receive mailings sent to permit holders. Additionally, in Canada, First Nations clambers and fishermen do hold permits.

Relying on written communication can also be problematic because literacy among resource users is inconsistent; not all people who receive mailings are able to read them. Penobscot East Resource Center recognizes that their newsletter may sometimes not be read, yet still chooses to send them out. It is possible that communication with graphics can be a powerful addition to mass mailings.

Of all the resource users, clam diggers as a whole were noted as being “the least plugged in to what’s going on. They’re on the outskirts of everything – but for the most part that’s how they want it. That’s why they’re clambers!”

### ***1.3.2 People who are apathetic***

Several advocacy-based groups, such as Fundy North, are primarily focused on representing the people that are members of their organization. All members pay dues to Fundy North. Maria Reccia noted that “the biggest obstacle to people joining [the association] is that they get representation for free, so why pay \$200.” As all of the marine-based organizations rely heavily on fishermen’s associations for representation, fishermen that are not represented in the association may also not be heard by the resource centers.

### ***1.3.3 People who oppose the organization***

Two interviewees from Cobscook Bay Resource Center noted that older fishermen, who have personally witnessed a decline in the fish stock and “understood what they had lost,” often wish to organize and self-regulate. Also, the youngest fishermen, who tend to be more ecologically focused, know “it is their future.” Yet, some middle aged fishermen, in particular those “with truck payments and a mortgage payment,” often wish to maximize their current economic gain from fishing and do not support the imposition of regulations such as a maximum daily catch. Penobscot East Resource Center has tried to pair older and younger fishermen in order to help increase knowledge sharing between these communities.

Still, a few fishermen simply do not want to be regulated at all under any circumstance and “think that the people in the Resource Center are environmental jerks.” There is a prevalent fear among many members of the fishing and forestry communities that environmentalists seek to lock up harvests, leading many resource users to be suspicious of anyone with a conservation ethic. One interviewee noted that seeking out the clambers and the poorest members of the community was critical in diminishing resistance from people who opposed regulation. “The people who want to make the case for unregulated harvesting will usually find the very poorest harvesters and

encourage the poorest to speak out and act out against conservation. Clam harvesters are at the bottom of the social, environmental and economic heap. Fighting with the people at the bottom of the heap and having them come out in favor of conservation really undercuts those above who didn't want to conserve.”

Several interviewees discussed how some resources users who had once been strongly opposed to regulation have now changed their position. “Some of the guys in the beginning that didn't want to join [the Fishermen's Association] have since joined and love the daily catch limit.” This is largely because the maximum daily catch limit prevents big boats from coming into their community and fishing out the harbor. Also, in the case of Cobscook Bay, catch limits are credited for protecting the bay's scallop fishery from collapse. Such perceived successes are critical in slowly establishing trust within the community.

## **SECTION 2: CULTIVATING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

All of the interviewees said that mutual trust is the essential foundation for community involvement. A slow process, the interviewees outlined a number of techniques to integrate the organization into the social fabric of the community. Listening, sensitivity to culture and time, showing results incrementally, and organizational learning were highlighted as the main strategies. In addition, conflict management and linking communities together were key parts of their work. The following section outlines the main challenges to community involvement and ways to address them.

### **2.1 Building trust**

Robin Alden noted that building trust has “a lot of magic to it, but no cookbook.” Even so, interviewees did identify a few ingredients to trust building. Although building trust with communities was, in some ways, easier for organizations with existing ties to the community, listening, cultural sensitivity, and patience were all highlighted as keys to engaging local people.

#### **2.1.1 Listen and be humble**

To establish trust, several interviewees noted that it is necessary to listen and be humble. “You really have to listen as much as you give back – make an equal partnership. You can't tell everyone that you're going to solve their problems. Those who don't get that come off as arrogant.” One interviewee highlighted the importance of listening in a cautionary tale about a recent community meeting. One “outsider” began talking about her ideas to help fishing communities, which ended with an uncomfortable silence and early end to the meeting. According to this stakeholder, this was a common phenomenon in fishing communities, where

summer residents have come to dominate community organizations such as churches, due to their quickness to act.

Listening not only helped build trust, but also helped these organizations identify locals' priorities and elicit their views about potential solutions. In fact, interviewees from two of the fisheries organizations noted that a major approach to building trust was to go to existing community meetings or local hangouts and simply initiate conversations and listen to community concerns. These conversations helped the organizations' shape their agendas to include projects and information services which were better attune to communities' needs.

### ***2.1.2 Prove you can do what you say you can do***

Several people emphasized the need to slowly build a reputation in the community and prove with small projects that "we were who we said we were." Another interviewee summed up this approach in this way: "Seeing is believing."

Discreet project successes can be instrumental in building trust for an organization with the community. For example, preceding the fruition of the Cobscook Bay Resource Center, the Cobscook Clam Restoration Project teamed clambers, scientists, school groups and local volunteers to monitor water quality in the Cobscook Bay. After successfully finding funding to repair several septic systems that dumped into the bay, recording marked decreases in fecal coliform bacteria levels and completing a clam bed seeding project, 2,000 acres of clam flats were successfully reopened. One flat of 250 acres produced over \$100,000 worth of revenue in the first year it was open. This major success was critical in embedding the organization in the community and helping it grow from the clam project into a resource center.

### ***2.1.3 Recognize the rate at which progress can be made***

All the groups surveyed emphasized the slow pace of working in nearshore community and ecosystem management. As said by Heidi Leighton, "People in this area of the state don't trust easily. Respect isn't gained through normal methods – not PhDs. Instead, it's who you know, who your family is, and whether or not your word can be trusted." As a result, gaining standing in the community takes time. According to the Cobscook Bay Resource Center's founder, "this is an organizing effort that will probably take about 20 years to be embedded in the community. It's not a project. It can't be pushed, only encouraged and supported."

While acknowledging the slow pace of progress was essential to community engagement, several groups expressed concern that the pace and long-term process of getting communities involved was a major issue, both in motivating employees and financing initiatives. One participant expressed concern about the financial sustainability of this slow work: "I feel such urgency because I feel

like the rest of the world works at a different pace than the fishing industry works...I fear that funding agencies will not have the patience for this type of work. Some will ask, 'If it takes so long is it worth doing?'"

#### **2.1.4 Devote staff time to trust building**

Given the importance of trust building, the Penobscot East Resource Center created a separate position explicitly for this purpose. The role of the *Community Coordinator* was to help start a conversation within the community about resource conservation. The work of this individual progressed slowly, but consistently. She had coffee with community members, attended church and community meetings. She worked to start conversations wherever possible, so as to show her presence within the community. The key skills identified by Penobscot East for the Community Coordinator role were: a) ability to listen; b) patient personality; c) community organizing skills; d) existing connection to the community. The most important skill was the ability to listen. Notably, these skills closely mirror the critical ingredients of trust building identified by all those interviewed, including those without a dedicated "Community Coordinator" position.

#### **2.1.5 Carefully evaluate the impacts of advocacy on trust building**

Each of the organizations interviewed can be categorized as either an advocacy group or as a neutral, facilitating body. Advocacy groups are those that will take a strong stand on a particular issue, lobby, or make management decisions. Neutral bodies, on the other hand, are those that help advocacy groups organize and build capacity. For example, an advocacy group might establish a maximum daily catch limit, including setting the actual figure for the limit. A neutral body, on the other hand, might help facilitate negotiations between conflicting parties when setting the limit.

The six organizations discussed in this paper can be categorized as follows:

##### Advocacy-based

- Fundy North Fisherman's Association
- Bay of Fundy Resource Center
- Downeast Lakes Land Trust

##### Neutral resource

- Coastal Livelihoods Trust (education-focused)
- Cobscook Bay Resource Center
- Penobscot East Resource Center

It is interesting to note that both of the fishermen-focused, Canadian organizations are advocacy groups. This may be because collaborative decision-making is more imbedded in Canadian than U.S. government practices

and, therefore, has institutionalized stakeholder-based methods of representation. Maria Recchia noted that several different fishermen's associations exist around the Bay of Fundy and often collaborate, even when representing communities that are historic rivals. This is because "we're in the same district. The government won't make decisions until Campobell [the neighboring fishermen's association] and Fundy North agree. We use consensus-building. The government won't recognize anything unless there's blessing from all."

Downeast Lakes Land Trust is distinct from the five marine-based organizations in both Maine and the Bay of Fundy for two major reasons. Most importantly, they own the Farm Cove Community Forest, the land on which they operate. They can make management decisions, and then act on them directly. In contrast, marine-users must typically work with local government officials to embed any management practices into law. Secondly, Downeast Lakes Land Trust contracts its harvest out to one, single timber company. In marine systems, since each fisherman operates separately, it can be more difficult to implement and enforce a consensually-derived management solution.

The two resource centers in Maine specifically stated that they act as neutrals so that all parties, regardless of where they stand on a particular issue, can seek help from the resource center. Most of the interviewees from these resource centers feel strongly that not advocating is central to their success in maintaining a trusting relationship with the whole community. For example, a major point of contention currently in Cobscook Bay is the potential construction of a Liquefied Natural Gas terminal on neighboring land. By not taking a side, the Resource Center is able to maintain the trust of opposing parties and facilitate discussions. Two interviewees noted that once trust is broken, it may never be mended.

The decision of when to advocate, how to advocate, or to abstain from advocacy was difficult for several interviewees. One interviewee said that it was a major challenge to strike the appropriate balance of taking a position too quickly, or consulting the stakeholders for too long and not taking a position quickly enough. At times, an organization unknowingly took a position that was detrimental to some of their resource users. Nonetheless, some constituents feel that the organization should spend less time on forming consensus and more time lobbying.

For some individuals, not advocating can be difficult, as typically the members of the organizations live within the community, too, and are personally vested in the community dilemmas.

### **2.1.7 Be Local**

The closer the members and directors of an organization are to their constituents, the easier it is to work within the community. As Downeast Lakes Land Trust was situated in such a small town and operated by people who also

lived within the same town, trust building was considered critically important, though not as challenging to establish as in larger, less tightly knit communities. Similarly, the Penobscot East Resource Center was more easily accepted by the fishing community because its founder was a fisherman himself. While it is not necessary to be from the area to work within it (the founder of Cobscook Bay Resource Center was a transplant), it appears to take longer for an outsider to gain trust within the community than a longtime resident.

## **2.2 Managing Conflict**

Conflict within a community can hinder the progress of any local group's efforts. In all circumstances, local groups should seek ways to not only reduce the impact of community conflict on their own work, but also to avoid exacerbating it in the community itself. In some circumstances, groups may decide to help resolve local conflict. Those that succeed provide a valuable service to their community and often lessen impediments to their own progress.

### **2.2.1 Kinds of conflict**

#### ***a. Deeply rooted***

Several interviewees in the regional organizations noted that the largest degree of on-going friction between stakeholders usually exists among members of different towns. "Town rivalries have existed for hundreds of years. It starts in high school basketball courts."

Two interviewees also noted strong conflicts between tribal and non-tribal populations. One interviewee observed that there are "multi-generational racial tensions" and "really angry feelings on both sides."

#### ***b. Issue-based***

Most interviewees believe that there are not specific groups that always conflict, but that the people in conflict change depending on the current issue. For example, conflict may exist between community members who would like to see more economic growth, versus those that more strongly support environmental protection. This value clash has been central to the recent debate in Cobscook Bay over a proposed Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility. The conflict is worsened because the LNG facility is seeking to locate on Passamaquoddy tribal lands, exacerbating the long standing tensions between tribal and non-tribal communities.

#### ***c. User groups***

Among resource users, inter-species conflicts were not as divisive as other conflicts, largely because many people fish multiple species, depending on the season. One interviewee noted, however, that lobstermen and urchin draggers have some conflict because their seasons overlap and believed that, due to climate change, lobster and urchin seasons may now be overlapping for longer. Another interviewee noted that some distrust exists between fishermen competing at opposite ends of the food chain (such as groundfish and pelagic species).

## ***2.2.2 Ways to mitigate impact of community conflict on your work***

### ***a. Neutralize your meeting locations, settings, leadership positions***

To mitigate the above conflicts, seven of the eight interviewees discussed how it is crucial to rotate the venue for any regular meetings, so that they are held in different towns, in different people's homes, showing that no one community or viewpoint is favored by the organization. More neutral settings, such as church basements, may help ensure that inter-personal conflicts do not prevent people from attending a meeting. Furthermore, they stressed that it is important for people in leadership positions, such as the Chair of the Fishermen's Association, to come from different places year-to-year so that no part of the organization became identified with any particular sub-region.

At Farm Cove Community Forest, meetings occur in the town building or in the Downeast Lakes Land Trust offices. Venue rotation was not identified as important, most likely because there is little fear of being identified with a sub-sector of the 150 person town.

### ***b. Foster unifying perspectives, identity***

One interviewee noted that inter-town conflicts may be improving now that their constituents have begun to identify themselves by their "ecological address." When the Cobscook Bay Resource Center first started, users of the bay most often said they were from a particular town, like "I'm an Eastporter." Now, many users say, "I'm from Cobscook Bay." This may provide a unifying identity factor.

In addition to forming a common geographic identity, one organization emphasized the importance of helping communities demonstrate their common interests and concerns. One interviewee recounted that most fishermen, regardless of where they come from, have more in common with each other than they have with others in their own town. To foster this connection, Penobscot East Resource Center tries to bring individuals from different communities together through leadership training. Later, many of the individuals are hoped to act as bridges between communities and advocate for their common interests. One interviewee noted that such networking will be particularly important in future

regulatory processes, where fishermen have historically advocated individually instead of as a network.

### ***c. Provide different opportunities for different interests***

While not in conflict, one interviewee discussed how different groups may simply not be interested in working with one another. As a result, the interviewee felt that it was critical for the organization to be structured so that there are many different projects and groups working simultaneously, allowing people to “plug in” where they are most comfortable. The organization called these *receptor sites*, “where any person who wanted to be involved could work without interacting with the whole group.” As a result, “Not all people had to come to one meeting and sit down with everyone else. Clammers and high schoolers and researchers all interacted with the resource center in different ways and at different times. We didn’t want to force people to be identified with any one group.”

## ***2.2.3 Building bridges to prevent conflict***

### ***a. Support working groups***

Two interviewees discussed that connections between groups are often built during meetings, but are sometimes lost without follow-up. In particular, this seemed to be the case when facilitating agreements between conflicting parties. For example, the Town of Perry, City of Eastport and Passamaquoddy worked on an informal agreement that each could dig clams in the other’s waters without a license. The effort was incorporated into local ordinances, but it didn’t last once the facilitators left the group because members of each community did not want to continue to work together. “We felt like we built a lot of social capital, but it didn’t sustain.” A principal role for an organization could be to help maintain these links, or identify the cause of failure.

One interviewee discussed how trusted individuals can serve as liaisons to help maintain group momentum and resolve internal disputes. The interviewee highlighted the importance of an outside person keeping in touch with affiliated groups at least once a month. An outside trusted figure “can help draw out negatives and add positives” by making suggestions and keeping groups focused. The role of an outsider was identified as important even for groups that appeared to be functioning well.

### ***b. Encourage the adoption of common principles as neutral guideposts***

One interviewee highlighted the importance of developing a common set of principles to guide future actions. These principles can help maintain a positive focus, unite groups based on common set of values, and remain goal oriented.

#### ***d. Foster inter-constituency learning to avoid and resolve specific disputes***

Several organizations reported that they work to foster inter-constituency learning, so that each community gains a better understanding of how other resource users interact with the ecosystem. Sometimes, such educational events will emerge in attempt to resolve conflict. For example, Coastal Livelihoods Trust brought together local fishermen andl tour boat operators to present a video demonstrating how there are critical moments when the motors from tour boats disrupt fishing. Prior to that meeting, tour boat operators did not understand the dynamic between their motors and the fish. Due to the meeting, the boat operators now call the fishermen before driving by.

### **SECTION 3: WORKING WITH FISHERMEN**

Three different interviewees noted that of all the communities they interact with, fishermen are the most difficult to engage. Yet, the ability to hook fishermen is central to the success of building a viable, community-based resource management plan for marine systems. This section outlines the obstacles to engaging fishermen and potential strategies for involving them.

#### **3.1 Why fishermen are difficult to engage**

According to an interviewee from Penobscot East Resource Center, fishing communities are often difficult to engage due to the “nature of the business they are in.” The high opportunity cost, the risk of losing a day of fishing, and tension between meeting and fishing culture make it difficult to organize fishermen to discuss resource conservation. These factors are exacerbated by negative experiences with fisheries management and distrust.

##### ***3.1.1. High opportunity cost of losing a day at sea by going to a meeting***

Engaging fishermen in activities, meetings and projects tends to be difficult due to the high opportunity cost associated with a fisherman losing a day on the water. Ted Hoskins from Penobscot East Resource Center described: “If you go to meeting, you lose a day of fishing. You lose your income of the day; your sternman loses his income for the day. You can’t make it come back...You go to meeting you feel like you had little impact. When you go back to your gear, you lose the pattern of where the fish are...it take a while to restore your understanding of how the gear is and the patterns of the week.” This economic risk makes it difficult to find the right time to involve fishermen in activities.

### ***3.1.2 Incongruence between meeting culture and fishing culture***

The lifestyle of fishing is different than meeting culture. Many fishermen chose the fishing lifestyle due to their affinity for working outdoors, being active, and working on their own. The results of one day of fishing are tangible, unlike meetings where it may be unclear by the end of the day what has been accomplished. The experience of being indoors all day and doing conceptual work is not common for most in the fishing community. Many fishermen are uncomfortable speaking in public or in a group. Illiteracy is also a major issue.

### ***3.1.3 Negative experience with regional fisheries management***

Many fishermen have had negative experiences with regional fisheries management. They are tired of going to meetings where they feel they did not have a voice in the process and that most of their concerns were not heeded. This experience also breeds distrust of talk about conservation and regulation. Individuals often view these organizations as a threat to their livelihoods.

## **3.2 Ways to engage fishermen**

All marine organizations emphasized the importance of engaging fishermen by creating personal relationships, building on existing social networks, being sensitive to schedules and culture, and maintaining positive action-oriented activities. In addition, all three resource centers interviewed tried to foster leadership in the fishing communities by providing training, facilitation, and support for independent fishermen's associations.

### ***3.2.1 Build personal relationships – get to know people and their interests***

Most groups emphasized the slow process of starting a dialogue about sustainable natural resource management. The early process requires mostly one-on-one conversations with individuals and slowly working to establish trust. One stakeholder likened this early process "missionary work." This included going to church, existing meetings, or having coffee or a drink with people and initiating a casual conversation. The main goal of these conversations was to get individuals to articulate their interests and concerns. The conversations served as a jump off point to identify concrete issues and potential projects.

### ***3.2.2 Use social networks to contact new individuals***

Several groups emphasized the importance of using existing networks between fishermen to initiate dialogue with others. As one interviewee described the process:

I talk to a friend who is a fisherman, and that usually comes with being around here for many, many years. I tell him that we are thinking of working on something. I ask him to think of someone who might be interested in that. After a while he gives me a name. Then I ask him to see if he'd ask if the other guy'd be willing to talk about it with me over coffee. Then I go with my friend and the guy and tell him about what we are thinking about and talk to them just as slow as you can go. I invite them to think about something but don't tell them what you need exactly just tell him enough to get him thinking about it on his own...if you push they will just back away.

Though slow, this process can help identify key individuals or leaders within the community who can help engage others. Using existing social networks also helps generate trust, especially for those outside the fishing community.

### ***3.2.3 Be aware of how fishing schedules effect communications***

If it is necessary to call a fishermen, the best times are usually weekdays between 3:30-7:30p or windy days when most fishermen are not likely to be at sea. Exact schedules vary by the season. Calls are most effective when they are from another fishermen.

### ***3.2.4 Keep early meetings informal, familiar, and off-the-record***

Once a project is underway, slightly more organized groundwork may take place. Four interviewees emphasized the importance of "kitchen table" meetings, where a fisherman may gather 4 or 5 of his friends to meet with someone from the resource center. According to two interviewees, the kitchen table, with no official recording of the conversation, is the least threatening environment. The sentiment that the process of organizing "took a long time and a lot of meetings" was commonly expressed by many interviewees.

Kitchen table meetings may progress to larger meetings in venues such as church basements. Yet, one organization highlighted that it is difficult to engaging fishermen in multi-stakeholder groups. Other groups, like retirees or summer people, tend to volunteer quickly to help. They have time, skills, and are well-intentioned. Many fishermen tend to take a back seat on issues and are quiet, so may feel overpowered by other stakeholders.

### ***3.2.5 Support fishermen who undertake positive, action-oriented projects to address community-wide concerns***

Two interviewees stressed the importance of developing positive action-oriented projects that stem from local resource users interests and concerns. Penobscot East Resource Center helped support the Stonington Fisheries Alliance to initiate a lobster hatchery project. Fishermen in this alliance had expressed interest in developing a hatchery project to help safeguard the fishery. Despite disagreement from the scientific community on the impact of hatchery projects on lobster population levels, because the idea came from the community, the Penobscot East Resource Center decided to back the initiative. They have helped with fundraising, bringing together scientists and fishermen, and managing the project with volunteers from the Alliance.

### **3.2.6 Make fishermen's needs an organizational priority**

While most of the marine organizations were fundamentally based around fisherman, Penobscot East Resource Center highlighted the importance of focusing exclusively on fishermen. They felt that this focus was necessary in order to “create room for fisherman to advocate for themselves” and their interest and to “survive in a multi-stakeholder arena.” As one interviewee noted:

Commercial fishing especially small scale fishing would never have a future if the people in the industry did not develop a competence to articulate their care for the resource. You can talk about processes with all the stakeholders. That is not where I am working. I am working on the fisheries industry level. Fishermen have special knowledge and need to develop their competence in a multiple stakeholder arena.

To help unearth fisherman's needs, Penobscot East Resource Center runs a series of I workshops taught in a dialectic and issue-oriented manner. They assembled a few individuals from different communities and asked them what the major issue was in their town. “It may be garbage or schools or how early stores close, or it may be fisheries...You have to start with their interests and concerns. Because coastal communities are dependent on fisheries you will eventually get [to fisheries].”

## **3.3 Ways to make meetings with fishermen more effective**

### **3.3.1 Regular meetings should be a resource for fishermen, not an obligation. They should be reliable and well-run regardless of turn-out.**

One interviewee emphasized the importance of keeping every meeting predictable and prompt. The fisherman's association that works with Cobscook Bay Resource Center meets 7-9pm on the second Thursday of every month. They start exactly on time and never go past 9pm. The Resource Center works with the Fisherman's Association to set the agenda, but is not formally involved in running the meeting.

Two interviewees shared the similar sentiment that, “Sometimes the meetings are well attended, sometimes they’re not. You have to let that go and realize that you can’t be concerned about individual meetings, but realize that you’re providing a resource that’s there when people need it.”

### ***3.3.2 Use social gatherings to minimize the use of formal meetings***

While a fisherman’s association may meet regularly, none of the resource centers organized regular meetings to avoid inducing meeting fatigue. Both Maine-based resource centers focused on stimulating conversations with individual or groups fishermen through suppers, church events, or over coffee. In addition, holding an annual or biannual gathering dedicated for social purposes alone was viewed as important to building community.

### ***3.3.3 Simple, oral communication often works best***

While Fundy North uses several traditional meeting facilitation devices (e.g., brainstorm lists, giving everyone colored dots), most other interviewees stated that fishermen “don’t respond well to normal meeting techniques.” One interviewee mentioned that some fishermen don’t read and that “Most don’t consider themselves ‘writers.’ Little things, like taking notes, don’t come easily. You have to modify the process.” As a result, oral communication tends to work best. Incorporating items such as flip charts, power point and maps tend to be confusing or distracting. When using such materials, one interviewee argued it is best to send people home with them rather than make them the center of meeting times.

### ***3.3.4 Skillfully facilitate meetings so that fishermen direct the outcome***

Penobscot East Resource Center emphasized the importance of a skilled facilitator to help fishermen feel empowered throughout the process. They highlighted importance of asking “obvious questions” and allowing fishermen to answer themselves. “Let them do the thinking and then you can elucidate...If you answer them they don’t hear it nearly as well as if you let them answer it.” This facilitation was viewed as particularly important when engaging fishermen with other stakeholders, particularly scientists.

### ***3.3.5 Let fishermen control the process***

Penobscot East also highlighted the importance of not pushing any particular issue but engaging local resource users to identify their priorities themselves and framing assistance in terms of meeting these local priorities. “Instead of saying, we can do this for you, [say] if something needs to be done we might be able to

help. This type of talk invites them to take the lead.” The goal of this facilitation is to keep locals in charge of as much of the process as possible.

### ***3.3.6 Let meetings be an organizational learning experience***

In addition, facilitation serves to train local resource users to develop the skills necessary for holding meetings on their own. They develop their own decision-making rules, identify their own priorities, and decide the next steps themselves. Several interviewees mentioned that fishermen now understand the importance of meeting agendas and minutes. While they still may not wish to take notes themselves, the Cobscook Bay Fisherman’s Association hired someone to take minutes for them. Another groundfish management board, known as the Fundy Fixed Gear Council, now has technical staff and manages their own budget.

## **SECTION 4: WORKING WITH OTHERS IN THE COMMUNITY**

In addition to working with their primary user group, many of the organizations promote programs with other stakeholders in the community. Some of the most common stakeholders to engage with are school-age kids, scientists, and other residents concerned about resource use or conservation. Occasionally, projects will take place that bridge multiple stakeholder groups.

### **4.1 Local kids**

Almost all of the organizations interviewed are involved in education of children and teenagers. Two resource centers have formal relationships with local schools where a member from the Resource Center will go into classrooms and take students out into the field. The Coastal Livelihoods Trust is predominantly education-focused.

Several interviewees asserted the importance of interacting with the children of the community. This is in part because they wish to equip the next generation of resource users with a stronger ecological awareness, but also because engagement with the area's children can help foster a deeper connection to the community. One interviewee told a story of how he had gained a fisherman's trust after working with his grandson in school.

### **4.2. Scientists**

Scientists are involved in different ways at every organization interviewed. At the Farm Cove Community Forest, biologists and foresters work with committees to help design the forest's harvesting plan, identifying areas ready to be cut, versus those that are best to leave undisturbed. Fundy North fishermen work with scientists on their boats to help collect data. At Penobscot East Resource Center, scientists and fishermen interact through "science roundtables," which are currently focused on a lobster hatchery project.

Penobscot East's process of bringing together scientists and fisherman to jointly solve management problems has been successful in building mutual trust. The following describes that process:

#### ***4.2.1 Timing and goals***

Science roundtables meet once a year for 1.5 days. The organizers structure the schedule carefully in order to a) create a common base of knowledge; b) honor different types of knowledge; c) ensure that fishermen and scientists stayed engaged; d) help fishermen and scientists get to know each other.

#### **4.2.2 Format and venue**

Interviewees stressed the importance of keeping lectures short and understandable and finding a venue that was comfortable to fishermen.

#### **4.2.3 Process**

The first roundtable began with short summary presentations by fishermen and scientists, followed by “get to know you” exercises.

A facilitator designated from the Resource Center asked clarifying questions throughout the lectures. For example, for scientific presentations “what do you mean by benthic?” or during fishermen presentations “what do you mean when you say on the bottom?”

The afternoon was dedicated to addressing more technical questions about the hatchery projects. Organizers were careful to make sure that some of the brainstorming involved the types of learning at which fishermen excel. For example, fishermen tend to be better than scientists at answering monitoring questions, which require thinking about geography.

In the evening, the fishermen and scientists gather at someone’s house for a drink and supper so that they can get to know each other. The following day, they create a monitoring plan for the future.

#### **4.3 Concerned citizens**

In Cobscook Bay, three different companies are interested in the possibility of tidal power. In response, the Cobscook Bay Resource Center has volunteered to be a center for information distribution. The tidal power companies hold public meetings at the center. This function has been particularly popular among retirees and second home owners, who tend to be interested in climate change issues. After discussing tidal power, the Resource Center has the opportunity to introduce the crowd to more of their programs and opportunities.

#### **4.4 Multi-stakeholder groups**

The Bay of Fundy Resource Center’s Learning Circles focus on skill development and training. The Circles are scheduled as demand arises and information about the circle is passed on by word of mouth. Topics are extremely varied, from Harvesting for Food (not commercial) to Digital Media as a Tool for Community Development. The attendees are anywhere from First Nations groups to high school students. The circles are sometimes led by an expert and at other times are more of a community round table discussion. In an effort to distribute the knowledge shared during the Learning Circles, the Resource Center is recording

the words of attendees as “testimony” and is hoping to present them as Podcasts or distribute them on CD.

## CONCLUSION

---

Although many similarities exist between the approaches of the six organizations discussed in this paper, it is difficult to extrapolate a singular model for engaging stakeholders in community-based conservation because of the regionally-specific process of building trust within a community. Two overarching themes of note, however, among all organizations were the difficulties in reconciling resource users' immediate needs and a long-term conservation strategy, and the need for metrics to better evaluate the impact of each organization on its community.

Generally, all the organizations surveyed faced difficulties in building trust in the community, engaging certain stakeholders, and bringing together different user groups. Most groups dedicated significant staff resources to building trust and managing conflict. Although their techniques differed in certain ways, we can identify common strategies for addressing these issues:

- Create a representative board
- Listen to different stakeholders in order to understand interests and priorities
- Generate projects from the “bottom-up” based on users' interests
- Show incremental success through small milestones
- Act as a consensus-builder or facilitator between different stakeholder groups to broker inter-constituency learning and mediate conflicts
- Prevent conflict by choosing neutral locations, fostering unifying perspectives and common identity, and creating separate opportunities for different interest groups

Although some organizations had an inclusive view of membership, others chose to focus on one type of user group (in our study, this was typically fishermen). All the organizations working with commercial fishermen acknowledged that fishermen were particularly difficult to engage in multi-stakeholder situations due to differences in culture, habits, and professional obligations. Yet most groups acknowledged that engaging fishermen, however difficult, was critical to sustainable nearshore management because of their specialized knowledge and stake in resource management. Major efforts focused around:

- Grassroots organizing through existing social networks, informal conversations and networking, and culturally sensitive scheduling
- Training in leadership and managerial skills
- Creation of local fisheries alliances to advocate for user-interests
- Facilitating projects based on these alliances' priorities
- Linking different fisheries groups together

Despite these similarities, there exist a few major differences between the groups surveyed. First, organizations appear split about the need for advocacy versus facilitation. The organizations interviewed took on three different roles in relation to resource management decisions and advocacy. Downeast Lakes Land Trust coordinates resource management of a community forest by members of the local community. Fundy North and Bay of Fundy Resource Center advocate for specific management decisions by government on behalf of their constituents

and members. Through direct service, project development, and training, Cobscook Bay Resource Center and Penobscot East Resource Center enable and empower their members and constituents to advocate for their own interests, while the groups themselves take a neutral stance on most resource management issues.

Working as an advocacy organization requires taking positions, which can make it difficult to gain trust from a broad cross-section of stakeholders, compared to acting as a neutral. The trade-off, however, is that the neutral cannot attempt to direct decision-making, even when they disagree with the results. The role of the neutral can be challenging for organization whose members who would like to guide changes in a particular direction and at a faster speed. This challenge often divides individuals within organizations about whether advocacy or facilitation is most needed.

Second, although some organizations appeared to have long-term strategic plan for community-based ecosystem management, others chose to focus solely on meeting short-term needs of different stakeholder groups. This piecemeal approach often detracts from larger conservation goals and makes it difficult to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the organization in fostering long-term ecological goals. The subsidiary role ecological goals play with respect to economic development is a common criticism of community based conservation. For these two competing objectives to complement each other, organizations need to evaluate their day-to-day actions in relation to a long-term ecological restoration strategy.

Even for those with long-term strategic goals, however, the slow process of building trust in the community means that staff time and resources are often spent on somewhat nebulous actions such listening, organizing and training stakeholders. For these organizations, securing long-term funding to support these activities is a major challenge, as foundations typically measure success through discrete project activities, instead of the more ephemeral goals of establishing trust and building up capacities for environmental stewardship.

Merging short and long-term goals appears less an issue for the one land based organization. This outcome may be attributed to the differences in direct ownership, versus working in publicly-used waters. For bay management, developing concrete social, economic and environmental indicators to measure program success may help orient resource users and organizations towards long-term conservation.

Another challenge in creating a long-term conservation strategy is the small spatial scale of each of the organizations. While fisheries management is an issue that crosses municipalities, states and nations, most organizations focused their project activities on individual bays or towns. The fact each organization worked at such a limited scale is not surprising, given the importance of trust and personal interactions in engaging stakeholders. However, the silo effect makes it

difficult to create alliances and influence broader policy changes. It consequently may limit the total impact each organization may have on long-term conservation.

In shaping a replicable process for community engagement, the Coastal Ecosystem Project needs to develop a process to reconcile short-term livelihood-based needs of the community with a holistic conservation strategy. Merging these two approaches may be particularly difficult for an organization that plays a facilitating role, rather than advocating for a particular agenda. We offer the following recommendations for the development of such a protocol:

- 
- Identify major stakeholder groups in the Muscongus Bay area
  - Begin conversations with individuals or groups currently working in the area in order to identify their interests and concerns
  - Map interests and communities in order to develop an understanding of potential areas of conflict, synergies, and ways to reconcile short and long-term goals
  - Organize roundtable discussions with individual user groups to build consensus among users about common interests
  - Create a set of principles or goals in collaboration with these groups to help guide future decision-making
- 

Our findings and conclusions are based on eight interviews from leaders working in collaborative conservation. We chose to focus our research solely on leaders in order to gain a better understanding of the internal dynamics of how these groups operate within the community. Our findings cannot be said to reflect the opinions of the communities, but rather highlight internal reflection of these organizational leaders. They are biased, as discrete success is measured through the lens of leaders and not the communities that they serve. Further study is needed to examine how communities perceive these organizations in order to assess the success of trust building and programmatic initiatives.

Moreover, our study tended to focus on process rather than outcomes. Most of our questions focused on ways of engaging stakeholders and program activities to stimulate their involvement. Adding direct questions about results, indicators for measuring success, and short-term and long-term planning may help us understand how coastal organizations measure their achievements. Finally, the small sample size makes it difficult to generalize across organizations. We attempted to highlight overlaps in approaches yet a large sample size would enhance the accuracy of these findings.

In sum, this report highlights the commonalities and differences between organizations approaches to stimulating community involvement around natural resource issues in near-shore ecosystems. Although it provides a number of strategies to engage different user-groups, measuring the success of these initiatives is difficult due to their piecemeal nature, slow-process of engagement, and differences in approaches. Future study is needed to examine how groups

evaluate program and organizations success in light of the slow process of community engagement.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The U.S. Geological Survey funded this research, which was conducted collaboratively with Quebec-Labrador Foundation and Environmental Policy Design funded by a grant awarded by the Jesse B. Cox Charitable Trust.

## **APPENDIX A: ORGANIZATIONS INTERVIEWED**

Following is a list of the organizations represented by the eight individuals interviewed for this study. Three of the groups are based in Atlantic Canada and three are in Maine. Five of the six organizations focus on community-based fisheries management, while one operates a community forestry project.

In general, we gained a good understanding of Cobscook Bay Resource Center and Penobscot Bay resource center, where MUSIC interns were able to interview multiple people from the same organization. We had the poorest understanding of Coastal Livelihoods Trust, as it was merged with a discussion of Fundy North Fisherman's Association.

### **Eastern Gulf of Maine**

The Eastern Gulf of Maine supports several different collaborative conservation efforts, both in marine and terrestrial systems. The emergence of these alternative forms of governance has occurred primarily over the last fifteen to twenty years and appears to be gaining momentum.

#### **Cobscook Bay Resource Center**, Eastport, Maine

Interviewees: Will Hopkins  
Heidi Leighton  
Chris Bartlett

The Center believes that a healthy environment, economy and community. To execute this vision, they help resource users organize and build capacity, they facilitate between users and they act as educators.

#### **Downeast Lakes Land Trust**, Grand Lake Stream, Maine

Interviewee: Mark Berry

The mission of the Downeast Lakes Land Trust is to contribute to the long-term economic and environmental well-being of the Downeast Lakes region through the conservation and exemplary management of its forests and waters. The land trust owns and manages the 27,000-acre Farm Cove Community Forest, and contributed to conservation of a total of 342,000-acres through the Downeast Lakes Forestry Partnership.

#### **Penobscot East Resource Center**, Stonington, Maine

Interviewees: Ted Hoskins  
Robin Alden

The primary goal of the Resource Center is to help build competency and leadership within the fishing community and to stimulate dialogue about resource conservation. To do so, the Center facilitates community science projects, education and advocates for community-based resource management.

### **Bay of Fundy**

The Bay of Fundy has several Resource Centers and fishermen's associations which operate separately, but often collaborate. The presence of multiple centers is because of the large geographic area of the bay, the need to work with both Francophone and Anglophone fishing communities (First Nations communities tend to find support within their Nation's government) and a government mandate for fishermen within the same district to come to consensual agreements on management decisions.

#### **Bay of Fundy Resource Center, Cornwallis Park, Nova Scotia**

Interviewee: Arthur Bull

The Bay of Fundy Resource Center focuses on education, training and advocacy for marine user and conservation groups.

#### **Coastal Livelihoods Trust, St. Andrews, New Brunswick**

Interviewee: Maria Recchia

The Coastal Livelihood Trust works to educate of children and young adults in fishing communities on the importance of marine stewardship, as a means of supporting their future livelihoods.

#### **Fundy North Fishermen's Association, St. Andrews, New Brunswick**

Interviewee: Maria Recchia

The association represents approximately one third of the small, inshore independent fishermen in the Bay of Fundy's Lobster Fishing Area 36. Fundy North's mandate is to support fishermen, promote healthy fisheries, and to encourage viable fishing communities in Southwestern New Brunswick.

## **APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS**

---

### **Warm-up/Assessment Context**

1. Tell me about your organization's work and its approach to marine resource/forestry/river issues.
  - How long has it been working on these issues?
  - How many staff work on these issues?
2. Tell me about the region where your organization works.
  - What are the major challenges facing the region ecologically and economically?
  - How would you summarize the local society and culture?
3. What impacts does your organization have or seek to have on the area and its people?
4. Who from the local population is directly or most affected by the work of your organization? (e.g. fishermen, farmers, loggers, scientists, municipal officials, boaters, bikers, land owners, local natives, summer residents, conservationists, artists, youths)

### **Describing Methodologies**

5. Can you give me some examples of projects your organization has worked on that have engaged specific communities within the population? What were the impacts in each project and who did they impact?
  - Please give us recent and past examples if possible
6. What did you do to get people engaged at the start? What approaches and techniques did you use? What worked well? What did not?
  - Did you have connections to these communities before you sought their participation?
  - If not, how did you figure out who were the most important people to talk to in each group? Was there one central figure who led the group?
  - Which were the most difficult groups to involve? How did you eventually get them to participate?
7. Please describe the process of local involvement in each project.
  - What did you ask the participants to do?
  - What was the goal of the activity/process? Why was it necessary to involve the targeted participants?
  - How often did you meet? For how long? How did you organize meetings?

- Was it a one-time event? (e.g. an interview, speaking out at a public hearing, providing a particular service, making a phone call)
- Or was it more involved? (e.g. taking science samples over time, serving on a committee, providing goods over time, providing routine advice)
- Did you work with people one-on-one or in groups?
- Did you try to bring different communities together? What were the difficulties? How did you overcome them?
- Was there a setting that was most useful? (ie. was it their turf, yours, or neutral)
- Did you use any special process “tools” or methods to engage people in the meetings? (Flip chart, images, PowerPoint, mapping, facilitation, etc.)

8. If their involvement was over time, how did you keep participants engaged in the project? What worked well? What did not?

- Were they compensated for their involvement (conservation hours, reimbursement for time or travel, college credits)?
- Were there any special enticements (food, speakers, contests, awards, etc.)

### **Reflection/Lessons Learned Across Projects**

9. Which communities has your organization engaged most effectively? What made it meaningful? Why?

10. Where have you encountered major obstacles? Were there issues that you could not be resolved? Which communities have you been less successful at engaging? Has funding been an issue?

11. What have you learned about engaging local people? If you were going to do it again, which groups would you target? What would you do differently? What would you do the same?

12. Is there anything else that comes to mind about your work with the community? Is there any advice that you would give to other organizations who want to involve their communities in the work they do - e.g. things to do or not do?

### **Closing**

13. For this report, I would like to interview one or two other people about the projects you have described. Can you suggest someone either from your organization or the community who would feel comfortable talking to us?

14. If I need to ask you any clarifying questions as I write the report, how should I contact you?

15. Do you have any last questions about this project and how we will write, revise and use the report?