**Whitewater to Bluewater**

Science Objective Call #3

January 10, 2013; 11:00-12:15

**Participants**: Caroly Shumway, Dianne Timmins, Steve Perry, Will Duncan, Emily Granstaff, Scott Robinson, Moe Nelson, Doug Besler, and Emily Greene.

Emily Greene began the call with an overview of the Whitewater to Bluewater calls to date:

On the first call, each Partnership presented an overview of their current science projects.

On the second and third calls, partnership representatives discussed the product utility and identified opportunities to collaborate. The focus on call #2 was EBTJV and ACFHP led projects, and the focus of call #3 (this call) is on SARP led projects.

Emily Greene asked if there were any objections to posting the notes from call #2 on the website. There were none.

The group discussed he following projects, as noted in the EBTJV, ACFHP, and SARP Science Projects Matrix (v6).

**Project tracking database**

Emily Greene reviewed what had been discussed on the last call pertaining to this item.

Emily Granstaff noted that the only update here is that they were thinking of incorporating the NFHP economic impact tool.

Caroly asked for more information on the economic impact tool. Emily Granstaff provided an overview of that tool. The group discussed how best to apply the tool to their partnerships.

ACTION ITEM: Emily Greene will send Caroly the link to the NFHP economic tool.

ACTION ITEM: Dianne and Emily Granstaff will send Steve Perry their FHP project tracking fields.

**Riparian planting tool**

Emily Greene reviewed what had been discussed on the last call pertaining to this item, noting that we had talked about having a roll-out webinar with the EBTJV tool is complete.

Steve noted that they have a meeting with the PIs later January 24.

ACTION ITEM: Emily Granstaff is currently working on getting their data up on the online mapper located at: seregion.database.org

**Risk of Flow Alteration**

Emily Greene noted that the impervious data associated with this project are something that ACFHP might be interested in as if they extent their assessment southward.

Emily Granstaff noted that in addition to the impervious data, the artificial waterbodies (evapotranspiration), and the water consumption (downscaled county water level surface water consumption) that is online.

ACTION ITEM: Emily Granstaff is working on uploading the initial results to the web at: seregion.database.org

Dianne noted that these are datasets that EBTJV is also be interested in.

Caroly noted that it’s hard to find consistent impervious surface across states.

ACTION ITEM: Emily Greene noted that they have some information on RI impervious data that she will send along.

ACTION ITEM: Moe noted that the C-CAP summaries impervious surface for entire watersheds of coastal estuaries, he will send some information about it. He also noted that the C-CAP is currently undergoing revision.

**Southeast Aquatic Resource Connectivity Project**

Emily Greene noted that the results of the SEACAP project would be of interest to ACFHP.

Steve mentioned that EBTJV is looking to identify in watersheds where barriers are of biggest threats, and prioritizing those watersheds. He noted that they had been working with downstream strategies, using the Chesapeake Bay as a starting point.

Emily Granstaff noted that TNC also applied the NE Connectivity project tool at the Chesapeake Bay level, which may be of interest to EBTJV and/or Downstream Strategies: <http://maps.tnc.org/EROF_ChesapeakeFPP/>

Will noted that there is another project going on where smaller barriers like culverts are being explored.

Emily Greene noted that DSS is aware of the NE Connectivity data set, but it may require some more manipulation in order to use it.

**MARIS**

Emily Granstaff is a big supporter of this (Marisdata.org). It includes fish data from all of the states in the 14 SARP states, with the exception of KY, MO, TX.

Emily Greene asked if the data in MARIS includes data from state inland agencies and coastal agencies?

Emily Granstaff noted that she thought it was more fresh water focused.

Steve noted that EBTJV has not used this database, to date.

Emily Granstaff noted that this data is for general fish communities, while EBTJV is a little more focused, looking at more detailed datasets.

**Aquatic Data and Decision Information Compilation Tool**

Scott noted that the funding for this never came through, so they’ve been focusing on other things (conservation planning atlas: salcc.databasin.org). Will noted that they’ll be leaning on the LCCs to pick that up. Emily Granstaff asked with the other FHPs interests are in this tool?

Emily Greene noted the idea of providing a clearinghouse of data is something that ACFHP had discussed very early on as a resource that it could provide to its partners, so from that perspective they’re interested in seeing what SARP has done. Emily noted that this is pretty far into the future however, so ACFHP would be happy to provide data.

Steve was interested in it from a Decision Support Tool perspective. EBTJV is working with the AppLCC, but sometimes not all the data can be put in one place, so it’s good to know where those other places might be.

This concluded discussion of the projects in the matrix, for which multiple FHP had interest.

ACTION ITEM: Emily Greene will send the Matrix out for the group to make any final revisions.

Emily Granstaff asked what the grant requirements are, in terms of products. Emily Greene noted that the notes and action items generated from the call were products required for the grant. She thinks that identifying data gaps is also part of the grant. She agreed that yes, the matrix could also be considered a product.

Caroly asked if we were still going to identify data gaps. Emily Greene noted that identifying data gaps will be the focus of the last call (February), for which she will send out a doodle. She noted that we’re not on the hook from a grant perspective for these actions and acknowledged that we all have a lot on our plates for the coming year, but on some kind of longer time horizon, that we could consider jointly pursuing a data gap that all three FHPs identify as a need.

ACTION ITEM: If FHPs have an updated Science and Data Needs list (post 2011) please send to Emily Greene. She’ll look at these, as well as the work that Doug Stang had done, as a starting point for our next call.