

**LISS Science & Technical Advisory Committee Meeting**  
**Friday, July 18, 2008**  
**UCONN Stamford, Room 225**

**10:00: Meeting begun and minutes from last meeting approved.**

- Mark Tedesco – New opening date for the STAC Fellows announcement is July 11<sup>th</sup>, closing August 1<sup>st</sup>.
- Charlie Yarish – Announcement reopened because of lack of enthusiastic applications during the initial period. This coming year, STAC fellows will be asked to assist with the sentinel site monitoring assessment.

**Research Monitoring and Assessment**

Mark Tedesco:

- Asked for comprehensive list of objectives and priorities for research in LIS
- Eutrophication committee had conference call and put together suggestions. Had received individual suggestions as well. .
- For those who simply want to know what needs to be done and not what has already been done, Appendix I at end of the document outlines the research and assessment needs identified for the Sound.
- Changes to document had been added in **bold** and distributed to STAC.
- Mark asks STAC to review document. Wants to see how this can be incorporated into a research RFP.
- Broader utility of this document goes beyond research RFP – could be incorporated into other announcements for research monitoring and assessment work.
- DO fund (which will fund similar proposals to the LISS) has not closed yet. July 25<sup>th</sup> or August 1<sup>st</sup> – reviews are due for proposals.

**Anne McElroy:** Can't wait until DO funds are announced.

**Sylvain DeGuisse:** The schedule we had originally proposed would have an announcement on August 1. This could still work, since if project is funded elsewhere, a pre-proposals could be submitted and withdrawn without much additional work.

**Jim O'Donnell:** concerned that they want to coordinate priorities with other funding sources.

**Sylvain DeGuisse:** Can't drop something off priority in order to coordinate, but if something is funded one place, we don't have to fund it twice.

**Cornelia Schlenk:** \$800,000 total for research.

**Charlie Yarish:** Talks about the need to incorporate emergency procedures for aggressive non-indigenous organisms. Need to be limber in response. Suggests that maybe we need to keep some funds back in order to give the agencies to respond.

Suggests that this emergency fund could be kept aside to deal with other things like oil spills, etc.

**Sylvain DeGuise:** Wants to think about where they draw the boundaries around what kinds of things could be used by this kind of a fund. Asks how this falls into their mandate.

**Mark Tedesco:** Limber not a word that is incorporated within the RFP process. Needs to be some sort of separate mechanism. Only way we could do it would be to award money to some organization to hold funds in order to begin addressing issues like this.

There are structures in place for oil spills at federal, state and local levels. BUT there are no similar structures in place for non-indigenous species.

**Charlie Yarish:** Suggests that it would be good to have some money sequestered for this issue.

**Carmela Cuomo:** Invasives not included in the priorities document as separate category and suggests it should be. Mark Tedesco and Charlie Yarish both suggest this could be incorporated.

**Charlie Yarish:** Raises question of whether they want to sequester funds to address this.

**Charlie DeQuillfeldt:** Talks about the expense of actually addressing these kinds of problems.

**Roman Zajac:** Suggests this is really a management issue

**Larry Swanson:** Only way to really deal with this is to force the state agencies to set aside funds for these issues. Not the place of the research funds. Monies would be a drop in the bucket.

**Ron Rozsa:** This kind of response is really in the realm of the agencies that do this kind of management. When/if something is important it seems that at least in CT, they have been able to get monies to address these kinds of problems.

**Charlie De Quillfeldt:** Talks about the problems of not regulating ballast water.

**Cornelia Schlenk:** Says that Sea Grant does hold back small amount of funds for these kind of issues. Doesn't think this is the best use of these research funds.

**Charlie Yarish:** Says that we should have a few words about invasives, encouraging new scientific research. But, it seems that the consensus is to get the management

committee to begin addressing this serious issue. Encourages people to send more comments.

**Mark Tedesco:** Jamie Vadrey put forth a series of recommendations during management meeting, particularly regarding sea grass issue.

**Anne McElroy:** Says toxics section could have been written 20 or 30 years ago. Would like to see some mention of emerging contaminants.

**Charlie Yarish:** Says to send these suggestions to Mark Tedesco to be incorporated into the document.

**Anne McElroy:** Says the research priorities in the document are based on loadings but does not mention effects. Need to know about impacts on ecosystem function. Under Living Resources section, she wonders why there is no mention of critical spawning habitat.

**Penny Howell:** Talks about how there are lots of data gaps regarding where spawning sanctuaries are. No data in waters shallower than 30 feet.

**Mark Tedesco:** Says that this was one element of need that was identified in the Sea Floor mapping workshop.

**Anne McElroy:** Worries that focus would be on the deeper waters.

**Mark Tedesco:** Inter-tidal waters will be included.

**Charlie Yarish:** Doesn't want to discourage good science. So would want to be more, rather than less, inclusive.

**Cornelia Schlenk:** Thought that they were going to go through the list and narrow it down – identifying priorities for RFP. What sort of budget will go for each priority?

**Mark Tedesco:** Says in past, limit has been \$100,000 per year.

**Charlie De Quillfeldt:** Talks about problems of PSBs around Huntington/Northfork area of LIS.

**Sylvain DeGuise:** Agrees with Anne regarding the need to include the ecosystem effects of different contaminants.

**Mark Tedesco:** Since emerging contaminants are ubiquitous – need to study effects.

**Carmela Cuomo:** At some point don't we need to ask as a group what are the critical pieces are that we need to address. Are we going to do a giant scatter-shot RFP or are we going to tailor it to five or six key things? What are we trying to do?

**Gary Wickfors:** Critical piece in all of this is the gap between the watershed and the main basin. There is clearly a recognition that there is a connection between the watershed and the main basin. Need to better focus on all of these interconnections between the coastal habitats.

**Jim O'Donnell:** Suggests that Gary is pointing to a "theme" that has priority rather than a list of priorities. Jim wants to identify some priorities – in favor of foisting a few items that we can identify and debate.

**Mark Tedesco:** It is helpful to have a useful priority document that is comprehensive. This is different from the research RFP.

**Charlie Yarish:** Says Gary's suggestion really interesting – bringing the focus back to near shore – where impacts are greatest and people interact most with the Sound.

**Carmela Cuomo:** need to come up with something more substantial before we leave this meeting. Need to agree on something. She likes Gary's idea of coming up with a theme. This is a critical bit of information that we all really like because of a variety of information.

**Paul Stacey:** Argues that we need to think more about the process of monitoring, assessment and research. Need to conduct the monitoring and assessment. Can't look at it from the perspective of "on the sound" but need to look at the larger ecosystem. Says that by picking favorite topics we are losing site of goal. Says this is going to take some real work.

**Sylvain DeGuise:** There has been a lot done. Document doesn't reflect shifting priorities.

**Carmela Cuomo:** Wants to brainstorm priorities.

**Stuart Findlay:** Reads like a catalogue of what has been done but it isn't a synthesis. There are internal contradictions. Between this and an RFP there is a synthetic piece that is missing.

**Mark Tedesco:** We have a list of needs, some pieces in place. We have to identify next step priorities. Hope would be that the synthesis would do that, but that is a ways off.

**Stuart Findlay:** Rather than trying to get specific about what needs to be done, put the burden on the proposal writers. Says given the time, we don't have much option.

**Bill Wise:** Agrees.

**Anne McElroy:** agrees. Best ideas aren't going to be generated in this room. Would hate to see an RFP preclude productive creativity. Then again we can identify priorities but leave it open.

**Jim O'Donnell:** Says it would be good to identify those things that are of critical importance for management, so that the reviewers can weigh that in their assessment.

**Bill Wise:** There is a lot not on the list that you would like to know about LIS.

**Jim O'Donnell:** Says that they should create a document that identifies the critical priorities.

**Johan Varekamp:** likes the free market approach.

**Charlie Yarish:** Likes Gary's approach – because many things fold within the topic that is at once a fertile thematic approach, one that is important to management and an area that has been historically underserved.

**Larry Swanson:** Would like to support Gary's proposal.

**Ron Rozsa:** Three years ago STAC convened an meeting to develop a comprehensive list. Brought ten pages or more on living resources, but most people came unprepared. Comprehensive list never developed. He likes the ideas of being more detailed about this is what we know, this is where we are; this is what we would like to know. But we have never gotten this on to paper.

**Mickey Weiss:** Says this comprehensive list would be useful as support material for applications to other agencies.

**Jamie Reinhardt:** Suggests Gary's proposal seems a lot more interdisciplinary than what has been put forth at earlier points. But it is certainly broadening the scope of those people that would want to access those funds.

**Jim O'Donnell:** Are we saying that we understand hypoxia? What is the variation of pycnocline, nutrient flux, SWEM model still has not

**Bob Wilson:** Which has an effect of TMDL assessment

**Jim O'Donnell:** \$100,000 does not even allow field work in the LIS. We do not know a lot of the important things about a very significant problem. We should choose RFPS that overlap with hypoxia.

**Paul Stacey:** Need to be careful about the message that we send in the RFP.

**Stuart Findlay:** Need to make it clear that the issue of relevance is important.

**Mark Tedesco:** In the past there was a pre-assessment.

**Sylvain DeGuise:** There needs to be a document that will help guide the reviewers.

**Jim O'Donnell:** Suggests that document doesn't really include the management priorities.

**Sylvain DeGuise:** We need to have guiding principles to allow those not "in the know" to be able to address the issue of relevancy.

**Mark Tedesco:** The document opens with the management needs. We will continue to add to the management objectives.

**Carmela Cuomo:** This document can guide those reviewing the proposals.

**Stuart Findlay:** This document is a catalogue, not the thematic guiding document.

**Carmela Cuomo:** RFP might say these are broad management issues in Long Island Sound.

**Roman Zajac:** We don't have synthesis yet. RFP: "Give us your best shot"

**Art Glowka:** Need to talk about fish

**Charlie Yarish:** Thinks there is enough space in the list to address the issues facing the fisheries.

**Paul Stacy:** Wants to move forward

**Jim O'Donnell:** Wants planning letter/ pre-proposal

**Anne McElroy:** Says that RFP should include statement about research addressing management needs

**Charlie Yarish:** We will follow through on that – will get draft out in a few days, incorporating suggestions from the committee.

**Mark Tedesco:** Regarding allowable indirect cost rates, previously EPA awarded grants directly. Negotiated indirect cost rates for that institution were allowed.

**Larry Swanson:** Are there funding camps, historically?

**Cornelia Schenk:** Screening will include Sea grant and STAC, the group will be set up to minimize conflicts of interest between people.

**Anne McElroy:** It might be good to use people from other states for pre-proposal review to help avoid conflict of interest.

**Mark Tedesco:** Use similar areas RI or MA or MD.

**Carmela Schenk:** People don't need to travel the preproposal could all be done electronically.

**Jim O'Donnell:** I have a problem bringing in people from other regions because they will not understand the priorities of the region. A document would be needed to help inform those reviewers,

**Cornelia Schenk:** Right now dollars are split between CT and NY Sea Grants, but that doesn't mean research has to be evenly divided between states. Aren't going to require a set percentage of matching funds from the applicants. If all dollars are not used, they will be rolled forward or rolled into some other research need. If money is short, both Sea Grants have agreed to contribute up to \$15,000 each to fund additional proposals.

**Sylvain DeGuise:** Pre Proposals due September 15, 2008, Review/Panel screens by September 30<sup>th</sup>, Full proposals due Nov. 17<sup>th</sup>, Mail out proposals for peer review 11/18/2008-12/23/3008. Review Panels meet 1/12/2009. Grants Awarded March 1, 2009.

**Anne McElroy:** Thinks better pre-proposals will be better if turned in by October 1 not September 15<sup>th</sup>. Talks about the problem of coordinating research groups in August.

**Sylvain DeGuise:** Says they worked backwards to ensure monies could be distributed by the time they would need to do field work. – five people support Anne's suggestion, a slightly larger number supports the original timeline.

#### **Addressing insufficient applications for LIS fellows programs.**

**Jamie Reinhart:** Raises the issue of the strange deadline timing for the LIS fellow applications – thinks that may have something to do with limited numbers of applicants.

**Elizabeth Pillsbury** – agrees – suggests greater applicant pool if applications go out in late fall/early winter to coordinate with other academic grant funding cycles.

**11:45 am Sentinel Monitoring For Climate Change, Ron Rozsa. *SEE ATTACHED Power Point***

- Marsh Border die back is occurring again.
- Going through old theses looking at marsh grass die offs suggests die-offs in twenty year cycles.
- Will divide Sound into three sections. Identifying clusters of monitoring sites in each section.

**Charlie Yarish:** we want to get good representation of different habitats from each basin.

**Larry Swanson:** at recent workshop, we have been looking at sites other than wetland marshes as well. New York is actively involved.

**Roman Zajac:** even short term monitoring at a particular site would be valuable for the database.

**Charlie Yarish:** very few places with that kind of long term data.

**Penny Howell:** best use of whole exercise is to make people aware of the long term data sets – but problems with simply uploading the data. She has massive data set, but they don't want to have them all over the place.

**Ron Rozsa:** Already data sets available online.

**Jamie Reinhart:** Shouldn't methodologies be associated with those data sets?

**Ron Rozsa:** Talks about this importance as well, especially as people connected with projects retire, etc.

The strategy for this project will be developed by the CT and NY working groups to come up with a recommendation for the LISS.

**Charlie Yarish:** Puts out pitch for monitoring shallow subtidal habitats.

#### **12:45 pm Long Island Synthesis:**

**Larry Swanson and Charlie Yarish:** Increased budget for honoraria has been passed. Management committee approved plan. Contract has been almost finally secured. No person can get more than \$1999 a year, so may have to bill out over a couple of years.

- There area number of people contributing a number of sections, so there might have to be a total cap on what any one person can get.
- Want to set some guidelines in regard to delivery. Want to have all the chapter or section leads submit an outline by October 1<sup>st</sup>.

- Will have services of a professional illustrator so that we can have a coordinated set of maps.
- Also have services of a professional editor.

**Roman Zajac:** helpful to have a list from the chapter letters about who exactly will be writing each chapter.

**Larry Swanson:** section leaders will have by October a detailed list of contributors of who will write what section. Section leaders have ability to distribute money in whatever way they want to – including holding a workshop.

- Abstracts for the Long Island Sound Biennial Conference due September 1<sup>st</sup>.

**Charlie Yarish:** October 1<sup>st</sup> deadline for ---- . Mailing from Corey Garza will send out copyright agreements for the authors. Electronic document with Springer guidelines available. Also has an author/editor questionnaire to help identify market for the book.

- Charlie was considering a February 1<sup>st</sup>, 2009 deadline for a first draft. They will ask authors for a list of potential reviewers for the chapters. Could look at a July 1<sup>st</sup> deadline for final drafts. Then everyone can reach deadline of January 2010 for final submission.

**Larry Swanson:** First and second chapters will not get as much money because they have fewer authors and the final chapter with Larry, Charlie, Mark and Corey will not get as much.

**Mickey Weiss:** Confused about terms and responsibilities. What are the responsibilities of the “writing class”? Need more guidance as to what he is supposed to be writing. What he asks of his section leaders is to provide more guidance. Communications need to be ramped up. Would like to meet face to face in section quite soon for direction.

**Larry Swanson:** Directs question to Cornelia and Sylvain: how soon is money available?

**Cornelia Schlenk:** Says that as soon as money is given to them, they can distribute it.

**Charlie Yarish:** Doesn't want to micro manage section editors, but wants to make sure things get done by the deadline.

**Mickey Weiss:** Wants a lot more specific information and direction for the worker bees.

**Larry Swanson:** Hopes that section leaders will develop annotated/populated outlines for the fall deadline.

**Anne McElroy:** We talked at one point about getting section leaders together again to hash out what group is doing what.

**Johan Varekamp:** Says it is the responsibility and “beauty” of section leaders to assign chapter leaders, sections, etc. within the sections.

**Mark Tedesco:** Monies should be available by September 30<sup>th</sup> at the latest, likely September 1<sup>st</sup>.

**Cornelia Schlenk:** Sea Grant has money but editors make decisions as to where the monies go.

**Larry Swanson:** Total of \$80,000 -- \$60,000 to the 8 chapters. Honoraria will be paid after the product is delivered.

#### **1:45 STAC FELLOWS**

**Jamie Reinhart:** Temperature Alters Recruitment Phenology: Effects on Community Level Interactions. *See Attached Power Point Presentation.*

**Elizabeth Pillsbury:** Selling the Bottoms, Undermining the Commons: Understanding Oyster Mapping Efforts 1880-1920. *See Attached Report.*

#### **2:15 Final Announcements:**

**Larry Swanson:** TNC presentation for future meeting since unable to present today. Supports assessment of indicators

**Mark Tedesco:** Shimon Anisfeld will give a presentation on his indicators assessment.