

Eric Frohberg ME
Jack Schwartz MA
Gary Buchanan (NJ)
Ron Sloan, NY
Ashok Deshpande (NOAA)
Rick Greene - DE

Jack couldn't get into the last advisory call. Eric will check on that.

Ron and Jack have spoken and are comfortable with their comments that have been passing back and forth – the issue is the description of the Mass data.

Gary has a number of issues that have come up. Eric sent an email. Based on a discussion bewt/ us and Larry Skinner. No Pennsylvania data. Wanna add pennsylvania and just say they have no data.

General feeling to add Pennsylvania.

Other chems: Ron feels should be added as a placeholder. Not an issue of paramount magnitude at this point. Gary – looks at individual, and yes, PCBs drive it. Agree at this late stage, don't want to get into a discussion of other contaminants.

Put something in intro – acknowledge other contaminants. Then maybe add something to intro. Ron was volunteered to write this. A sentence or two in the intro, and then maybe a statement in the recommendations

Other one on the list – data maps. Eric needs to revise – bins. also the Red to Green issue. Rick was OK if we have a disclaimer –Jack – votes for symbols. Eric will fiddle focusing on size of the dot vs. color. General feeling is that symbols will be better for black and white reproduction.

Issue of add something in intro to make clear the variability in the data may not make it comparable. Gary will add some language.

Eric will summarize the new Maine data after the fish forum.

Issue of RI data. Gary and Ron discussed before. Thought there wasn't any more data. Ron says they were analyzed at a lab where we would question the reliability of the data. Should we use the data? RI data, are about ½ the other concentrations. Discussed three options – throw out the data, report as is, or report with qualifications. Ron votes for the report with qualifications. RON will write a qualification of this data.

Eric will write up a better intro for the NOAA bluefish study.

We then discussed Jack's re-write of summary and conclusions.

re: looking at NY as a percent – while that makes some sense – more in question is whether or not the data of a state is representative of that state. Not whether NY is really dominant. Jack – the issue is whether or not you compare from state to state, it falls apart. Gary – don't want to say that if one has 300, and one has 50, then the 50 is not ok. Jack – but can't compare between states and sample sizes. The other driver is the magnitude of the contaminant problem itself. Ron – since other fish are less contaminated then, don't need more data in less contaminated sites. Jack – but when you have such a skewed distribution, then that needs to be acknowledged. Gary – don't understand, we're not doing an overall average. Gary's point not sure of what is the concern, if NY has 59% of the data points,

Ron – in the recommendation for a study in the future, use the variability of each state's data to calculate an adequate sample size. E.g., Maine may not need to sample more than 50 fish, but NY may need 4 times that based on their variability.

Jack – the other issue is the strength of the fishery. E.g, Maine may have to sample less and NY less, until they change their current regulations. Not sure how you would weight the data based on the strength of the fishery – big difference between rec or commercial.

There was a question as to whether this effort is dealing with commercial or recreational fish – the answer (from Eric) was only recreationally caught fish.

Gary – I think I see where you are heading with this. Gary votes for presenting the data as is, but there are other PCB sites, where we don't have the data (e.g., New Bedford harbor), I don't want to get into that kind of discussion ... the data are the data....

re: conclusions - General feeling is that the 2nd and 3rd are more overall project summary not for this section. Gary will take a crack at re-writing this section.

Ashok – add a brief discussion of the previous years data.

Ron won't make it to the forum. Neither will Jack.

Decision to Delete “next steps” – recommendations will suffice.

Rick –also highlight the fact that our recommendations are confined to the data. Re-title recommendations to “recommendations regarding the fish tissue data”.

Eric talked about the overall timeline.

We'll reschedule after the forum.