**Steering Committee Conference Call: December 15, 2015**

**Participants**

Heather Breeze (DFO), Adria Elskus (USGS), Jawed Hameedi (NOAA), Jim Latimer (EPA), Matt Liebman (EPA), Kathryn Parlee (EC), Marilyn ten Brink (EPA), and Christine Tilburg (GOMC)

**1. ICUC Release**

Christine Tilburg updated the Steering Committee on progress towards the release of the ICUC app. The app is actually available from the GooglePlay and iTunes stores at this time. Sara Ellis (US) and Donald Killorn (CA) are installing the photo brackets at the pictures sites this week. Christine intends to release the app to the ESIP community the first week of January (as an announcement and a journal entry). Christine stated that most of the sites were selected for particular reasons (example: the site at Wolf’s Neck was selected to photograph marsh change because of green crab activity). Heather Breeze asked if there is a photo of the bracket and sign that she could forward to groups that are selected for installation. Christine stated that she will connect with Sara Ellis and have an image sent to Heather ***(Action to be taken: Send Heather Breeze the requested image).***

**2. ESIP 2.0**

Christine then reminded the group that the majority of the conference call will be dedicated to ESIP 2.0 activities. Prior to the call the Directional Subcommittee summary document (with ESIP 1.0 and ESIP 2.0 framework) and slides from a conversation with Paul Ringold (EPA) were sent to Steering Committee members. Jim Latimer stated that he is still trying to wrap his head around an appropriate framework. Kathryn Parlee stated that she went back to the ESIP 1.0 indicators to see where they fell with respect to Final Ecosystem Goods and Services (FEGS). Jim stated that he has talked to people at EPA that are not happy with the FEGS model (in particular the artificial break between intermediate and final ecosystem goods and services). She stated that some of the ESIP 1.0 indicators work within the FEGS model (examples: fisheries, aquaculture, and ocean jobs). Jim stated that he doesn’t feel the Steering Committee needs to focus on specific indicators right now but they do need to figure out how to develop the framework to organize the ESIP community. He also mentioned that one of the difficult parts of this process arises from the fact that the field is moving so quickly.

Christine stated that ESIP 1.0 was relatively easy as the subcommittees could be divided by theme area. Marilyn ten Brink stated that one of the big differences is the importance of how the boxes will be chopped. Jim stated that a lot of similar projects across the country are driven by stakeholders. Christine agreed and reminded the group that Kirstin Howard (NH DES) told the Steering Committee (October conference call) that stakeholder discussions determined the three focus areas of their ecosystem services work. Jawed Hameedi pointed out that if you look into the literature there are 100s or even 1000s of indicators being suggested to incorporate ecosystem services.

The group then discussed the specific slide (Slide 4) that showed the flow for intermediate and final ecosystem goods and services with respect to crabs in the store. Jawed stated that he likes the FEGS/EGS concept but thinks focusing on things like “crabs in store” seems strange. Adria Elskus agreed that it is difficult to think of the crabs in store example as the crabs in the water will also be affected by whether there is fishing for them. Matt Liebman agreed the model is not clear. Matt suggested that seagrass might be an intermediate EGS in this model but might be more of a FEGS in other models. Christine agreed that she has difficultly with this concept too. Jawed agreed that if the seagrass goes away people will start caring about the seagrass making that the FEGS (example: Tampa Bay).



(Slide 4, Ringold powerpoint)

Jim stated that the important thing might be to focus on the categories and then divide up the subcommittee work. Heather stated that she has a hard time thinking about doing this without a particular management question (example: snow crab populations). Kathryn wondered if we should look at the framework starting point by key issue/question (e.g. decrease on shrimp, swimmable waters), by specific ecosystems or habitats (e.g. eelgrass, estuaries) or by specific ecosystem services (e.g. water filtration, flood protection). Christine thought that might work with the addition of a subcommittee for support of ESIP 1.0 and subcommittee for emerging issues.

The group then discussed Slide 11 and the linkages between drivers, intermediate EGS, FEGS, and human well being. Adria pointed out that the slide left out “final goods and services”). Kathryn wondered if FGS were included in the human well being box. Adria suggested that ESIP’s role might be to look at the transition parts. Adria stated that it comes back to who ESIP’s audience for this is.



The group then discussed a different approach that focuses on stakeholder derived issues. **Jawed gave an example with HABs. The ESIP 1.0 question might be what causes the bloom. The ESIP 2.0 questions might be how does this affect humans (drinkable water, disease exposure, fish kills, etc.).**

The group then discussed a best way forward. It was suggested that a pilot ESIP 2.0 might be a good step forward. The group wondered how best to look at the stakeholder issues. Kathryn stated that if the issue is clean water the process could work backwards from that. Christine mentioned that this is how the NH process worked. NHDES did stakeholder meetings to come up with three important habitats: eelgrass, oysters, and salt marsh. They then looked at ecosystem services with respect to those three habitats. The Millennial project also determined important issues. Matt stated that every National Estuary Program has also done similar stakeholder efforts. Jim liked this idea and thought one key issue might be habitat and another might be clean water. Heather mentioned that the Ocean Health Index also lists out issues.

Christine suggested that she look into issues of importance according to Gulf of Maine National Estuary Programs, the Ocean Health Index, EPA’s human well being effort, Atlantic Canada’s ecosystem services, PREPs report and others forwarded by Steering Committee members. She will bring these together for the January conference call. The Steering Committee can then continue this discussion with that important information.

**Next Steering Committee meeting: January 26 and 10 AM ET**.