

General personal comments from Hilary:

This was a great idea and should be continued at future NEAEB conferences. It provides an excellent opportunity to creatively address and discuss issues as well as meet new attendees. Being the initial test bed for such an exercise makes it a challenge, and I would suggest for the future that there be fewer questions, and questions that are more explicitly stated. For the question “what aren’t we monitoring and should be?” it was unclear if the subject was to be a resource type or specific indicators. We chose to do both. Folks were also directed to address the question from an ecological standpoint only, and not from a viewpoint of resource availability, costs, or regulatory implications.

QUESTION 16

“WHAT AREN’T WE MONITORING AND SHOULD BE?”

Round 1

Sonya Carlson- Gen-X

Pete Mitchell - Gen-X

NO LEGACY STAFF

1. Would like to see macroinvertebrate collection used for tissue contaminant analysis due to the fact that these organisms are more sessile than other aquatic biotic indicators and may make source detection a little easier.
2. Zooplankton sampling should be enhanced in lake monitoring for varied testing. They are easy to collect and it is important to determine what is there, determining biomass, and for use in assessment of toxins (microcystins)
3. Geospatial coverage of monitoring efforts appear to be very limited and should be improved upon.
4. Need for more involvement of people with more simplistic indicators and measurement tools.
5. Despite trying to stay away from logistics, the topic came up of not enough staff to support status and trends assessments. State agencies are looked upon as monetary sinks with their resources under valued. Outside agency opinion perceives that the agency does not create jobs or revenue.
6. One opinion was that we should be monitoring for potentially dangerous algal toxins as it is a simplistic and inexpensive measure.
7. Baseline monitoring of indicators that may not be based in standards probably a good idea.

8. Invasive zooplankton should be monitored as indicators of lake alteration.

SESSION #2

Warren Kimball- legacy

Adrienne Pappal- Gen-X

John TIPPANY- Gen-X

1. Mass state monitoring program- Sampling mainly conducted in large rivers and headwaters remain unsampled. Point sources are sampled every 5 years based on the rotating basin approach to coincide with permit expiration times. Sampling programs are primarily designed around permits. This current approach does not capture trends, as three data points per year are necessary to determine a trend. Sites are sampled once annually and then not for another five years.

Status on big rivers can't measure trends, hg and acid rain never saw them coming. Should be sampling at trend stations. Need consistent long term monitoring. Don't have long term data at reference and trend stations, need long term data.

Targeting point sources once every five years based on rotating basin doesn't do it for trend analysis.

2. impervious model used as a surrogate for all stressors. Focus should be more on larger systems. Urbanization a key stressor.
3. MA does minimal lake sampling, no wetland sampling,
4. wetland and lake metric development needs to be different for different lake types.
5. a watershed approach may be the best approach for prioritizing which resource types should be monitored (i.e. acid rain, NPS, point source, etc) none should be neglected, but prioritization may be the best approach with limited resources.
6. water supplies only sampled on the "finished" side, not the raw water side
7. Big disconnect between within state water resource programs (i.e. wetlands doesn't talk to permits, doesn't talk to rivers folks) Massachusetts
8. MEDEP has better cross communication with within program offices
9. need more toxicity testing (maybe tied into homeland security) –fluorescent dye test with daphnia feeding –screen for bioterrorism-2 hour test
10. Toxicity testing needed to compliment routine monitoring, this appears to be on the decline.

Round #3

Nicole Wright - Gen-X

Kathie Dello – Gen-X

John Nagle - Legacy

Bill Richardson – Gen-X

Sarah Wheeler – Gen-X

1. More real time monitoring is needed in order to address chronic but intermittent pollutant discharges.
2. Large rivers predominantly monitored in NY, but a need exists for smaller stream order monitoring in order to capture climate change stresses
3. A need exists to sample small lakes, no information is available in VT for lakes less than 20 acres.
4. In NY small wetlands are not addressed at all.
5. In NY remote lakes are not sampled enough.
6. A large disparity exists on large river monitoring with many groups and poor communication among them. Better coordination and communication necessary.
7. There was a concern expressed over destructive sampling (i.e. high mortality with electro-fishing). It was stated that if done properly, electro-fishing can be a very effective tool with minimal, if any mortality.
8. Stated that we should be looking at more of a variety of trophic levels with various indicators.
9. New technology was thought to be potentially very useful (i.e. on-lake remote sensing technology).
10. Needs to be more collaborative exposure to new technologies.
11. State agencies and academia usually coming from two totally different perspectives. It was thought that this gap should be closed.

Consensus that T-Shirts need to be re-instated!!!