**Steering Committee Conference Call: September 19, 2013**

**Participants**

Heather Breeze (DFO), Jawed Hameedi ( NOAA), Jim Latimer (EPA), Matt Liebman (EPA), Kathryn Parlee (EC), Marilyn ten Brink (EPA), Christine Tilburg (GOMC), and Rick Wahle (UMaine).

**1. American Lobster Settlement Index (ASLI) Project**

Dr. Rick Wahle (UMaine) joined the Steering Committee at the start of the call to discuss the American Lobster Settlement Index project. ESIP and ALSI have agreed to do a joint two page fact sheet on ALSI and the delivery of ALSI through the Indicator Reporting Tool. Rick provided background and history for the project which started while he was working on his PhD. As the range of the project was the topic of at least one question, Rick explained why the locations have been chosen. He mentioned that previously no lobster settlement was observed in Newfoundland but he would like to go back as he expects range shifts due to climate change. Rick stated that ALSI is a strong and important indicator of the health of the resource and recent effort has been undertaken to use ALSI as a forecast tool.

Matt Liebman wondered at the title of the project as he thought the sampling was a direct measurement. Rick agreed but stated that the project title was means as a catchphrase for the project, not a direct descriptor.

After Rick left the call Christine Tilburg requested that all comments on the first version of the ESIP portions of the fact sheet be submitted by **September 27.** The text will be resent with the call notes. Christine mentioned that one of the reasons she is excited about this mini-fact sheet is that it will be of interest to a group of ALSI users that might not be already familiar to ESIP. It might grow the ESIP audience in a new direction. ***(Action to be taken: All Steering Committee comments due on the ALSI text by September 27).***

**2. Reevaluate Indicator Criteria**

The Steering Committee then discussed the criteria table that Christine put together following discussions during the August call. Christine listed out in the table indicator criteria from ESIP, Jim Latimer’s Long Island Sound work, the National Climate Assessment document, and the draft criteria for the Sentinel Monitoring work. Matt mentioned that the Sentinel Monitoring committee that put together the criteria (Christine works on this small committee also) tried to summarize and capture a variety of criteria in a very short list.

Christine wondered how the Steering Committee would like to move forward. In particular, she requested that Steering Committee members look through the table and make suggestions on combining criteria or moving criteria questions that were not included in ESIP 1.0 up into the list for ESIP 2.0. Examples were given of criteria that might be consolidated. Kathryn Parlee noted that some of the criteria would need background information along with the question (example: links to conceptual model).

The Steering Committee agreed to review the table and send comments/suggestions to Christine by **September 27.  *(Action to be taken: Christine is requesting revisions be submitted by September 27).***

**3. 18 Month Plan**

The Steering Committee then discussed the draft 18 month plan that Christine send out prior to the call. Christine mentioned that comments have been submitted from Adria Elskus and Jim. She is going to incorporate the small revisions into the document while leaving larger picture discussions in track changes and send out this revised document with the call notes.

Jim stated that one of his major comments regarding ESIP 2.0 is the idea of not limiting the indicators to addressing functionality in the Gulf of Maine. He would like to broaden the concept to include ecosystem integrity which brings in resiliency. Christine gave an example of one of the fisheries indicators that looks at the reliance of fishing revenue to one or two species. Jim agreed with the example stating that resilience could refer to both natural or anthropogenic pressures.

The group needed clarification on the “think-tank” subcommittee that was discussed at the June meeting. The following description is taken directly from the notes at the June meeting:

“Christine told the Steering Committee that the ESIP 2.0 discussion has come to the point that she needs milestones and dates to be set so that she can start moving things forward. The group discussed the different parts of ESIP 2.0.

1. Revising the indicators left behind in ESIP 1.0
2. Looking at indicators in terms of the functionality of the system. This might be addressed through the cross-cutting themes that came up through the phone evaluations (climate change and eutrophication). Jim Latimer comment: “I’m not sure we should limit this effort to strictly “function” For example, if we evaluate N loading and seagrass extent (a structural indicator) and it produces a useful relationship, I’m not sure that it is an ecosystem function we are defining (e.g., I think of function ecologically – processes such as rate of primary productivity (function) vs. standing stock of phytoplankton (structural indicators). Perhaps “structure” should be added in addition to function. Or even “…in terms of interrelationships within the system”?”

With respect to looking at the long list of ESIP 1.0 indicators. The Steering Committee likely needs to re-evaluation the criteria for indicator selection. Christine then needs to bring the subcommittees back together and then get them to walk through those lists and see if any of the indicators should be addressed or brought back up for discussion in ESIP 2.0. This set of work should be finished by December/Winter 2013.

For addressing the other portion, the following timetable was set for creating **a work group to discuss a conceptual model** to address the cross-cutting indicators: note drafted in August and sent out in September. A call to be held in November with a model hopefully drafted in January (in retrospect that sounds pretty optimistic).”

The group agreed to take this into account when suggesting changes to the 18 month plan. Christine requested that comments on the 18 month plan be submitted by **September 26.** The group agreed that Section 4 (in particular) needs to be expanded upon.