**Steering Committee Conference Call: August 20, 2013**

**Participants**

Adria Elskus (USGS & University of Maine), Jawed Hameedi ( NOAA), Jim Latimer (EPA), Matt Liebman (EPA), Abe Miller-Rushing (NPS), Marilyn ten Brink (EPA), and Christine Tilburg (GOMC).

**1. ALSI/ESIP Fact Sheet**

Christine Tilburg opened the call with a discussion of the Maine Seagrant program that ESIP has been involved in with Rick Wahle (an ESIP member in the Fisheries Subcommittee). The American Lobster Settlement Index (ALSI) project intersects with ESIP on a couple of different fronts. ESIP delivers the ALSI dataset through the Indicator Reporting Tool. Rick would also like to do a two page fact sheet with ESIP on ALSI and ESIP. Christine has drafted up some text for ESIP’s portion of the fact sheet and would like to get the Steering Committee’s comments. The Steering Committee wondered who the primary audience for the fact sheet and asked Christine to obtain this information from Rick.

Rick’s response (e-mail 8/20/13): “The target audience would be fishing industry members, fishery managers, policy makers, scientists, as well as the interested public. The annual updates usually appear in Commercial Fisheries News either verbatim or in slightly altered form.”

Abe Miller-Rushing also wondered if the Maine Seagrant team would be involved in the drafting of the fact sheet (specifically Catherine Schmitt). Christine replied that Rick has specifically mentioned Catherine’s name. (Abe also recommended Catherine’s book Coastal Companion: A Year in the Gulf of Maine). The group had questions as to why the index is called “index”. Adria Elskus requested that the Indicator Reporting Tool call the parameter “Lobster Settlement Index Project”. ***(Action to be taken: Make this change to the Tool).***

Christine suggested that Rick be invited to the September Steering Committee call for a discussion of the project. The group agreed that they did not know much about lobsters but were curious given changes in population. ***(Action to be taken: Invite Rick to September Steering Committee call).***

**2. Reevaluate Indicator Criteria**

During the June Steering Committee meeting the group decided to revisit the initial indicator criteria prior to bringing the ESIP members back together to revisit the indicators that were set aside for the priority indicators. The original indicator criteria are below.

* Is the indicator scientifically valid?
* Is it responsive to change?
* Does a cause and effect link exist?
* Are there accurate data available?
* Is the indicator relevant to users?
* Is it comparable regionally?
* Is it useful at different scales?
* Is it comparable to targets, thresholds, or standards in the states and provinces?
* Does it indicate a condition?

Prior to the call Jawed Hameedi sent a document with criteria that are being used by the National Climate Assessment Development and Advisory Committee:

* Scientifically defensible
* Link to conceptual framework
* Defined relationship to climate, feedbacks, or impacts
* Spatial scalable
* Temporal scalability
* Builds on or augments existing efforts
* Of national significance (not necessarily nation-wide) – should link to the conceptual model
* Relevant to management decisions
* Useful for educational purposes
* Is it a leading indicator?
* Builds on existing data sources
* If new indicator proposed, likelihood of development and testing within 1 year given existing funding sources
* Stability/longevity of dataset
* Stability/longevity of indicator
* Scientific validity of indicator
* Data publicly available and transparent
* Indicator methods fully transparent and documented

Adria commented that she likes how succinct the table that Jawed sent ahead is and Jim Latimer agreed (Jim requested the full document from Jawed and Jawed is seeing if that is possible). A discussion was also held about the framework that the above indicators fit into. In the end, the framework chosen was the DPSIR framework (which, loosely, ESIP uses). Jawed mentioned several other frameworks that were under discussion that vary in complexity. Jawed recommended an article by Mooney et al, 2013 (<http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2013/01/04/1107484110.abstract>).

The group agreed that a good next step might be to create a table for the September call bringing together criteria that Jim has recently worked on for Long Island Sound with criteria that Matt is working on for the NROC/NERACOOS Sentinel Monitoring project. The criteria bulleted above (from ESIP and Jawed’s project) can also be added in. The group can then look at common criteria and note which criteria that ESIP might be missing that need to be added in. ***(Action to be taken: Table needs to be prepared for September conference call).***

**3. Communications Plan**

Christine suggested that this part of the conversation be shelved until September so that all individuals have time to read the plan that was forwarded with the agenda. In addition, she would really like Susan Russell-Robinson (who assisted with obtaining the communication plan) and Kathryn Parlee (Canadian co-chair) to be part of the conversation. Abe wondered if the Maine Seagrant office had ever been engaged about helping with outreach for ESIP. Christine did not think so. She stated that when she worked for the Georgia Coastal Research Council the Georgia Seagrant office had helped a lot with outreach. She would like to engage some of the Seagrant offices in this fashion. This might be another topic to address during the September conference call.