**Coastal Development Conference Call – July 17, 2013**

**Participants:**

 Carol Eyerman (Town Planner, Harpswell)

Liz Hertz (Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation, and Forestry)

Laura Hayes (USGS)

Becca Newhall (NOAA)

 Marilyn ten Brink (EPA)

 Daniel Savard (NB Department of the Environment)

 Christine Tilburg (GOMC - ESIP)

*\* Slides were prepared for use with this conference call*

**Reminder of where we are**

As the group had not met in some time Christine Tilburg opened the call with a reminder that the first three of four indicators had been wrapped up (point sources, population density and employment density) and the final indicator (impervious surface) has undergone quite a bit of analysis. Laura Hayes provided much of this analysis through internal funding from the USGS.

**Impervious Surface**

Christine reminded everyone that there were several individuals she was asked to specifically follow-up with regarding New Brunswick impervious data: Tim Vickers (Saint John) and Bill Budd (Moncton). She connected with both and they stated that there was not further impervious data. Therefore, Laura worked with the information that was available from the previous ESIP project with the St. Croix Waterway/USGS.

Christine reminded the group that impervious surface calculations were made for each county in the Gulf of Maine watershed as a discussion point (Slide 4). Slide 5 showed results for similar calculations for New Brunswick. The group on the call felt that the calculations made sense compared to the nearby Maine counties. Daniel Savard stated that the calculations made sense considering how nondeveloped those areas are.

Individuals on the call then discussed the figures as presented in Slides 6 and 7. Liz Hertz commented that she had difficulty discriminating between the 5-10 bin and 10-15 bins. The group agreed that it was very difficult to see differences in the whole Gulf of Maine figures (although Becca Newhall stated that when zoomed into specific cities – such as in Slides 8-11 the colors can be compared more easily). Christine and Laura commented that many color combinations had been tried but they were open to suggestions. Liz wondered about going to fewer bins such as 0-15, 15-30, and >30. Christine worried about not having the 10% impervious level as a bin threshold since that percentage point is so important. **Christine suggested having the following figures available for comparison on the next call: One set with: 0-15, 15-30, and > 30 and one set with 0-10, 10-15, 15-30, >30.**

The group liked that suggestion and that will be made available for a decision during the next call. ***(Action to be taken: See above).***

Christine wondered how the group felt about having a case study on the impervious surface page either discussing other methodologies for determining impervious surface or looking at one or two of the cities at a more zoomed in level. Liz stated that she did not like the idea of confusing the reader by showing a different method and her preference would be to zoom in to other cities. Both Becca and Carol Eyerman agreed. ***(Action to be taken: Case Study in fact sheet will zoom into one or two cities).***

The group also discussed other side bars and Daniel Savard stated that he is still concerned about users understanding the importance of natural imperviousness in New Brunswick. Christine stated that this topic should likely be covered in a side bar (perhaps towards the beginning of the fact sheet). ***(Action to be taken: Side bar discussing difference between natural imperviousness and man-made imperviousness).***

**Next Steps**

Christine then wondered if the next steps (after looking at the final figures/bins for the impervious surface maps) would be to start outlining the fact sheet. Marilyn agreed that it is time to move forward. Christine stated that she will start putting the outline together for a call in September and pass the outline by Marilyn first. Marilyn requested that the outline go by Daniel first too – for a little cross-border perspective.