



## **CBGN Working Group Minutes – October 12 2004**

**Joseph Macknis Memorial Conference Room, Chesapeake Bay Restoration Center  
Chesapeake Bay Program Office, 410 Severn Avenue, Annapolis MD 21403**

### **Participating:**

Lisa Gutierrez, Marci Wolf Ross, Elizabeth Hughes, Vanyla Tierney, Bob Munson, Robert Carter, Lynn Bostain, Bob Campbell, Jonathan Doherty, Rod Torrez, Cheryl Branagan, Michael Land, Catherine Mueller

### **Guests:**

Janet Reingold and Vicky Jones (Reingold), Beverly McMillan, Claudia Schechter

The meeting convened at 10:00 AM.

The minutes from July 7 and September 9 were passed with no changes.

### **Implementing the Communications & Marketing Plan**

Discussion focused on building CBGN brand awareness through three major, related efforts: implementing the Joint Marketing Strategy, enhanced media relations and communications, and product development.

**Joint Marketing Strategy:** The cooperative agreement signed between NPS, MOTD and VTC outlines a number of elements of a CBGN marketing strategy, including unified fulfillment for CBGN travel information, collateral development, planning for an advertising campaign, baseline visitor research and training. Most of these elements will be implemented in calendar year 2005.

**Media and Communications:** NPS has contracted with Reingold to coordinate non-travel media relations and to develop a variety of internal (i.e. within the CBGN) and external communications products. This will improve the effectiveness of the message we are sending about the Network to the non-travel media, partners, gateways, etc. Gateway partners are one key focus, as one member stated "the more effectively we can reach the partners, the more effective they can become."

**Product Development:** CBGN products can help advance the overall brand and attract visitors to Gateways. NPS has contracted with the Minor Group to work with the Product Development



your Chesapeake connection

National Park Service 410 Severn Avenue Suite 109 Annapolis MD 21403 1-800 YOUR BAY (968 7229)



Committee in detailing product development initiatives. This ties in closely with recommendations included in the enterprise strategy document developed for the CBGN Support Partner and may include products such as branded images, the Gateways Passport Program, educational and interpretive merchandise, etc.

### **Modification and Expansion of Marketing Committee**

Marci Ross and Lynn Bostain outlined recommendations for converting the current ad hoc communications and marketing committee to a Marketing Committee. Working Group members agreed to establishing the committee and to the charge outlined in the materials provided.

### **Review of Draft Support Partner Agreement**

Discussion of the draft cooperative agreement for establishing the Chesapeake Bay Gateways Network Fund (Support Partner Organization) was led by Claudia Schechter to discuss points of interest and highlight changes that the group wished to consider. The following points were brought up for discussion at the meeting.

- Who does the support partner answer to? The support partner will still have to answer to the board of National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, but will be closely tied to the policy and program leadership provided for CBGN by the Working Group and NPS.
- Will there be costs for NFWF's role in fostering the support partner? Certain financial services will have a fee, charged either as a minimal percentage or by transaction. These fees will cover NFWF's administrative services.
- What will the funds raised be used for? Revenue generated will be used for supporting CBGN activities including reinvesting in Network-wide initiatives, training opportunities both Network-wide and at Gateways, etc. These revenues will offer flexibility for the Chesapeake Bay Gateways Network in funding other projects for which NPS dollars cannot be used.
- What should be the makeup of the friends board? The initial board would have 6-8 principle members with room for growth. This board will need to raise the initial capital for the contract staff.
- Who will sign the agreement for the Working Group? Elizabeth Hughes nominated Bob Carter to be the signatory official for this cooperative agreement. Marci Ross seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously.

Working Group members were encouraged to send specific suggestions and comments on the draft to Jonathan Doherty or Claudia Schechter.



your Chesapeake connection

National Park Service 410 Severn Avenue Suite 109 Annapolis MD 21403 1-800 YOUR BAY (968 7229)



## Advisory Opinions on Nominations

Advice was requested from the Working Group on two potential Gateway nominations (Thomas Point Shoals Lighthouse and the Annapolis History Center).

**Thomas Point Shoals Lighthouse:** Thomas Point Shoals Lighthouse (TPSL) is considering whether to submit a nomination to become an independent Gateway. The Working Group currently recognizes TPSL as a component or program of the Annapolis Maritime Museum (AMM) by virtue of AMM's role in developing and managing interpretation at TPSL, both at AMM and at the lighthouse.

The Working Group also discussed the consortium's interest in several aspects of whether an independent designation for TPSL would be beneficial to TPSL or AMM. The conclusions of Working Group members are as follows:

1. Would independent designation improve visibility and exposure of TPSL in CBGN communications, marketing and visitor information materials?

While Gateways are currently listed on the CBGN Map & Guide by the Gateway name, in this case AMM, members felt that CBGN currently provides a high degree of visibility for TPSL in several ways, including the Gateways website lighthouse feature and the lighthouse poster guide. They felt CBGN could also explore other appropriate measures to profile TPSL.

2. Would independent designation ensure broader eligibility for Gateways grants (whether for interpretation, public access or conservation/restoration) for TPSL?

Working Group members felt this would not be the case, as TPSL is already viewed as a component of AMM it is fully eligible for Gateways grants.

3. Would independent designation avoid competition with other AMM priorities in Gateways grant award decisions?

Working Group members agreed the grant review process has always been based on the merits of each individual grant proposal and not on an arbitrary limit on the number of awards per Gateway. Gateways have received multiple awards in a given year, including AMM this year.



your Chesapeake connection

National Park Service 410 Severn Avenue Suite 109 Annapolis MD 21403 1-800 YOUR BAY (968 7229)



Generally, the Working Group also felt that an independent nomination of TPSL would be confronted by several issues, including:

- As TPSL is not yet open and accessible to the public it would not yet qualify for independent designation.
- As AMM is the primary launch point for all visitor tours of TPSL, AMM is the logical site to which to direct visitors.
- Consistency with past designation practice favors recognizing lighthouses as part of the designation for the primary visitor contact site.

Based on the discussion, members suggested that an independent nomination is not the optimal approach to pursue, and that CBGN should continue to support and highlight TPSL through the AMM designation.

**Annapolis History Center:** The Historic Annapolis Foundation inquired regarding nomination of the Annapolis History Center. HAF previously nominated the foundation as a Gateway in early 2001. In reviewing the nomination, the Working Group did not find the nomination to meet the eligibility criteria. At that time, members felt the individual public facilities managed by the foundation provided limited Bay-related interpretation. HAF subsequently nominated the proposed Annapolis History Center in late 2001. The Working Group reviewed that nomination in early 2002. Members felt the center, when developed as conceived, would have the potential to qualify as a Gateway, but agreed the center was ineligible at that time as it was not yet open to the public. At that time, the Working Group recommended that the National Park Service offer to consult with HAF on interpretive planning for the center.

Working Group members were posed the question: "Given the past nominations, in what form and time period would the Working Group feel it appropriate to consider a nomination for either the current open properties or the Annapolis History Center?" They noted that HAF is particularly interested in the possibility of being eligible to apply for Gateways grants for interpretive exhibits in the Annapolis History Center.

Working Group members were not aware that there has been a substantial change in the factors considered in the initial nomination of the foundation and its open properties. Given that, they were not clear that there would be a different outcome than in the 2001 decision. They did, however, discuss whether it was worth considering the designation policies relative to



your Chesapeake connection

National Park Service 410 Severn Avenue Suite 109 Annapolis MD 21403 1-800 YOUR BAY (968 7229)



“developing sites.” Elizabeth Hughes and Rod Torrez volunteered to outline some options and bring information to the next working group meeting.

### **Conference Planning**

Claudia Schechter distributed a brief update on planning for the 2005 CBGN conference.



your Chesapeake connection

National Park Service 410 Severn Avenue Suite 109 Annapolis MD 21403 1-800 YOUR BAY (968 7229)