

PUBLIC INTEREST ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PIAC) MEETING
April 29, 2002, 3:30 to 5:00 PM, WHOI Carriage House
FINAL MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

Members Present: Patty Foley, Save the Harbor/Save the Bay (chair); Bruce Berman, Save the Harbor/Save the Bay; Peter Borrelli, Center for Coastal Studies; and Steve Tucker, Cape Cod Commission.

Observers: Cathy Coniaris, MADEP; Steve Lipman, MADEP; Mike Mickelson, MWRA; Andrea Rex, MWRA; and Larry Schafer, retired.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

1. PIAC approved the October 2001 minutes with no amendments.
2. P. Foley will contact A. Solow to discuss OMSAP meeting format and the mussel tissue exceedance.
3. P. Foley will communicate to MWRA PIAC's interest and priorities related to the review of the Monitoring Plan.

MINUTES

REVIEW OF DRAFT OCTOBER 16, 2001 MINUTES

ACTION: PIAC approved the October 16, 2001 minutes with no amendments.

BIOACCUMULATION OF CHLORDANE AND PAH IN MUSSEL TISSUE: A CAUTION LEVEL EXCEEDANCE

P. Foley noted that since all of the members present were at the OMSAP meeting, that another presentation from MWRA on the summer 2001 mussel tissue contaminant exceedance was not needed. She is glad that there will be mussel testing and review for summer 2002. P. Borrelli thought that there was a lack of clarity on the part of OMSAP as to what "action" was before the panel. For example, there were times where the words "approve" and "accept" were used interchangeably. By Roberts Rules, if a committee is submitting a report, the group can move to accept the report, but not necessarily approve it, and the issue can be revisited. However, in the end, he thought the correct actions were taken. Relative to the issue of the threshold, a more thorough, scientific, and regulatory discussion has been left for future discussion, but he thought this could have been resolved today.

S. Tucker thought that there was a fundamental level of confusion during the OMSAP discussion. Perhaps it would have been worth discussing the use of an additional species for the bioaccumulation monitoring to make sure that uptake and retention are similar. He also was surprised that OMSAP was discussing cost and practicality since he does not think that is in their charter. Though OMSAP wants to be responsible, he thinks that is an agency/management issue. He thinks greater clarity would be welcomed as well as a thoughtful evaluation of the material and a clear grounding in the material ahead of time.

B. Berman thinks that had MWRA asked for a change in the mussel tissue contaminant thresholds ahead of time, he thinks OMSAP's response would have been more structured and focused. Overall, he was initially very anxious when he first heard about the exceedance, but through this process, the "comfort-level" of his understanding of this situation has increased. In many ways, the process worked, but he does agree with both S. Tucker and P. Borrelli that the discussion was awkward.

However, he is not sure that if it had been less awkward that he would have been as happy with the outcome. P. Borrelli thinks we should be realistic in that frequently issues of science and methodology do bring up concerns of cost. However, there is a certain attendant responsibility to articulate how one would spend the money otherwise. For example, there was some discussion on the possibility of gaining more understanding by conducting more analyses of the effluent rather than using caged mussels. B. Berman asked if the caged mussels are placed directly in the effluent plume. A. Rex replied that they are suspended 30 feet above the bottom in the plume.

S. Tucker was happy about the Inter-Agency Advisory Committee discussion about continuing the mussel monitoring, although he would not necessarily advocate mussel monitoring to be continued indefinitely. He also does not think that the 60-day “snapshot” [period when the caged mussels are deployed in the summer] is an accurate picture of the effluent. B. Berman would also like to see the mussels deployed for longer than 60 days. A. Rex explained that the reason why the deployment time is 60 days is because this is during the stratified period (i.e. lowest dilution), after the mussels have spawned, and during the period of most activity. This also matches the deployment time for the baseline studies. B. Berman thinks that there would be different results if MWRA tested an organism that lived there for a longer period of time. A. Rex added that they also collect lobster and flounder for tissue analysis. B. Berman noted that these are migratory species and that is somewhat different. He added that it also matters in what form the contaminant is in when the mussels come in contact with it, dissolved or particulate. M. Mickelson replied that this study examines dissolved phase contaminants that equilibrate quickly, and thus the mussel results are a good view of what was happening at the time.

P. Foley thinks it would be useful that once the minutes of this meeting are prepared, for her to contact A. Solow to make sure that PIAC weighs in on the mussel issue. P. Borrelli said that he did not think that the OMSAP discussion on mussels was structured well. M. Mickelson said that after MWRA explained their analysis, some OMSAP members asked “why monitor mussels”, and this turned the conversation in a direction that was unexpected. P. Borrelli thinks that MWRA should give more guidance on what is it from the agenda items that is expected from OMSAP. A. Rex replied that MWRA did ask for them to comment on MWRA’s proposal for additional work. OMSAP did comment by saying that MWRA should not move forward with the additional work. They also reviewed the mussel material and those who are known to have a deep scientific understanding of the material agreed that it was not an issue of mussel health or public health. Those are the questions that MWRA wanted reviewed by OMSAP and this was accomplished at the meeting. B. Berman thinks that in other cases where OMSAP has had sharper discussions, they have been within the context of a request for a change to a standard. This was an exceedance report as opposed to a requested action.

ACTION: P. Foley will contact A. Solow to discuss OMSAP meeting format and the mussel tissue exceedance.

DEVELOPMENT OF PROCESS FOR REVIEW OF AND MODIFICATIONS TO MWRA'S EFFLUENT OUTFALL AMBIENT MONITORING PLAN

P. Foley thinks that it is a good time to review the Monitoring Plan. She also noted that while monitoring has been conducted for 10 years, monitoring for the new outfall has only been conducted for two years. She asked the PIAC members if they had any issues they would like to discuss pertaining to this. P. Borrelli thought that the information briefing from MWRA was excellent. He thinks a review is called for, to see if things can be done better. The outcome of some of the early investigations during the post-outfall period may be sufficient to address issues of station placement and frequency, and dollars saved in one area could be possibly applied in another area. There may also be some monitoring ideas that were left behind the first time around that could be revisited. He asked

how much flexibility MWRA has in the next 6-18 months with respect to budgeted expenses. A. Rex replied that they are flexible contractually but it is the requirements of the permit and the Contingency Plan that guide MWRA. P. Borrelli thinks that it is important to have flexibility, otherwise this review will be nothing more than a management exercise. A. Rex said that the Monitoring Plan is attached to the permit, but there is a process in place for making modifications to the Monitoring Plan. P. Borrelli thought that was good. A. Rex noted that effluent and toxicity testing were not discretionary unless there is a major permit modification. M. Mickelson added that MWRA is currently not requesting any modifications to any thresholds.

B. Berman agreed with how the review will begin, by describing what is currently monitored. He urged that the purpose of the review be not to merely reduce monitoring. It would be a mistake not to consider at this time what we might also be doing. He also thought the information briefing was helpful and prompted a useful discussion. A. Rex said that MWRA can not maintain this intense level of monitoring effort over the long term, and it would be wrong for them to waste money. B. Berman said that he was not suggesting that they waste money, but he does think that there may be more science and additional monitoring that should be considered. It may be that there are new questions that need to be answered. He is concerned that the first goal is cost. P. Foley thinks his point is well taken but we are still in the beginning of this process. P. Borrelli thinks MWRA will always be concerned about cost because of its revenue stream. P. Foley agreed and said that most members of this group and others from the public would argue against merely reducing the monitoring. P. Borrelli thinks that everyone needs to be open-minded and flexible during this process. It may be that the plan evolves and priorities shift, but one day something terrible will occur and MWRA would not want to be in the position to not have the capacity to be able to respond quickly. Two years of post-discharge monitoring is not enough to have a history to look back on.

S. Tucker thinks an evaluation of the Monitoring Plan is a good idea. He has some of the same reservations that B. Berman articulated. He understands the practicality of the situation and the needs that are at stake. He also believes that with the foundation of knowledge that has built up and new science, new monitoring options will become available and he hopes that they are considered. He asked MWRA about their idea of a screening criteria or a mechanism of testing to get at unanswered questions. A. Rex replied that they have been thinking of various ways of looking at statistical significance. There are also other structures of monitoring programs that have been considered such as a tiered monitoring program where there is more intensive monitoring if an incident occurs. MWRA may want to move toward these approaches in the future. B. Berman thinks that monitoring not only answers questions, but also increases public confidence. P. Foley would not be surprised if MWRA did ask to reduce some monitoring. A. Rex noted that MWRA is cutting back on its rate support (debt service) this year. P. Foley said that PIAC will come back to MWRA with some sense of their interest and priorities as it relates to monitoring and figure out how the group can be helpful.

ACTION: P. Foley will communicate to MWRA PIAC's interest and priorities related to the review of the Monitoring Plan.

P. Borrelli said that in all likelihood, the Cape groups would want to revisit some of the issues pertaining to the farfield. The Center for Coastal Studies (CCS) has some preliminary data that are potentially alarming. The last Center for Coastal Studies nitrogen isotope monitoring report (fall 2001), did not report any acute findings within the areas of investigation (phytoplankton, zooplankton, dissolved inorganic nitrogen, and physical oceanographic measurements). It did, however, make note of two things, a "nitrogen front" that was at the entrance of Cape Cod Bay and a nitrogen "hot spot" in the vicinity of Plymouth. As Stormy Mayo reported to OMSAP, the right whale situation in Cape Cod

Bay is alarming given the lengthy 20-year CCS database. This is the first time in 20 years that such low numbers have been observed. In 2001, ~115 individual right whales were seen in Cape Cod Bay, and their period of residency was high. This year, ~20 individuals have been observed and their period of residency was low. The reason why was a complete breakdown in the zooplankton food supply (*Calanus*) in quantity and quality. Overall, there is a lot more that needs to be looked at. What worries him is that the biochemistry that is essential to the food web may in some way be disrupted. This could be the beginning of a story that would require a lot more investigation and would be alarming both from an environmental and a public policy standpoint. Perhaps an impact on the farfield could be due to something that happens in the nearfield that alters the biology throughout the system and ultimately has an impact in the farfield. We do not know if the changes we have seen are due to changes from well outside the system such as the large chlorophyll bloom in the fall of 2000. We would like to increase our efforts if we can obtain more funding, because these are not observations that we expected after only a year and a half. It is surprising that these events all coincided in time.

B. Berman asked whether other years with low number of right whale observations were also dry years. P. Borrelli replied that in 1986 there were low numbers but they remained in the summer. 2002 is worse because of the very low numbers of right whales and the plankton did not set up the way it has in the past 20 years. Perhaps this is the beginning of a cycle that we have not seen before in our data, but has occurred many times in the past. C. Coniaris asked about the right whales that are feeding in Great South Channel on zooplankton patches. P. Borrelli replied that the federal surveying does not relate to behavior or habitat so they do not know if the whales are feeding. In the case of the whales north and east of Stellwagen Bank, we have sent a research vessel to take samples and have determined that they are feeding and there is the critical mass of patches sufficient for them to feed. Overall, the 2002 observations in Cape Cod Bay are a concern but all of the scientists involved are being properly cautious because the connection between cause and effect is very difficult to determine.

ADJOURNED

MEETING HANDOUTS:

- Agenda
- April 2002 OMSAP/PIAC/IAAC membership lists
- October 2001 draft PIAC minutes
- MWRA information briefings and copies of presentations

Summary prepared by C. Coniaris. Post-meeting comments are included in [brackets]. All such comments have been inserted for clarification only. They do not, nor are they intended to, suggest that such insertions were part of the live meeting components and have been expressly set-off so as to avoid such inference.

PUBLIC INTEREST ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PIAC) MEETING
July 15, 2002, 2:30 to 4:00 PM, WHOI Redfield Auditorium
FINAL MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

Members Present: Patty Foley, Save the Harbor/Save the Bay (chair); Bruce Berman, Save the Harbor/Save the Bay (alternate); Sal Genovese, Safer Waters in Massachusetts; and Steve Tucker, Cape Cod Commission (alternate).

Observers: Cathy Coniaris, MADEP; Stephen Estes-Smargiassi, MWRA; Pam Harvey, MADEP; Ben Kelly, Save the Harbor/Save the Bay; Mike Mickelson, MWRA; Andrea Rex, MWRA; and Silvia Spring, Save the Harbor/Save the Bay.

Boston University students: Fahed Alzonoochi, Brenda Berasi, Irfan Budisiswanto, Kullaya Chiammanisakul, Marc Core Claudio, Vicki Ann Frawley, Zack Gou, Tom Goucher, Tamim Jabr, Jessica Kelly, Laurie Lopez, Juan Pablo Mendoza, Mary Murphy-Phillips, Megan Newcomer, Gerry Poulin, Jessica Rosery, Herb Ross, Sunit Srisainsuchat, Jin Toppi, and Yu-Chi Wang.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

1. PIAC approved the April 2002 minutes with no amendments.
2. C. Coniaris will find out if the Massachusetts Open Meeting Laws would allow a web discussion among OMSAP members that could be viewed by the public.
3. P. Foley will draft a PIAC consensus document about what the group would like to see presented at the public meeting. PIAC will meet via conference call to discuss the content of this document.
4. PIAC suggests OMSAP host their annual public meeting after the two workshops, and to have the meeting scheduled at two locations.
5. C. Coniaris will find out if J. Montoya will present to OMSAP at their September 24 meeting.
6. P. Foley and C. Coniaris will report back to PIAC on the protocol of OMSAP response when there is an MWRA exceedance.

MINUTES

REVIEW OF DRAFT APRIL 29, 2002 MINUTES

ACTION: PIAC approved the April 29, 2002 minutes with no amendments.

PROCESS FOR EVALUATING THE MONITORING PLAN

P. Foley said that PIAC needs to determine its role during OMSAP's evaluation of the monitoring plan. PIAC has two important roles, representing the public and informing the public. A. Rex outlined the approach that OMSAP discussed during their meeting [see July 15, 2002 OMSAP minutes]. B. Berman suggested inviting the public to the OMSAP workshop in November instead of having a separate annual public workshop.

P. Foley asked S. Tucker if he thought the content of the workshops included what the Cape would like to see reviewed. S. Tucker replied that the Cape Cod Commission has not met to decide what is currently missing from the monitoring plan. S. Tucker is concerned that decisions will be made at a second meeting and that there could be important discussions behind the scenes. B. Berman agreed.

ACTION: C. Coniaris will find out if the Massachusetts Open Meeting Laws would allow a web discussion among OMSAP members that could be viewed by the public.

P. Foley said that PIAC will respond to OMSAP by sending a memo. She thinks that OMSAP will take their time to do a thorough review and that we will be able to count on them. **ACTION:** P. Foley will draft a memo to OMSAP outlining the opinions of PIAC members on the review process.

S. Tucker noted that the review schedule is very tight and we need to make sure that the review is done well. S. Genovese thinks that it would not be a problem if OMSAP members were asked to make decisions at the end of a workshop. He thinks that much of this review will be difficult to understand for his constituency.

P. Foley asked the PIAC members how they felt about having a public forum after each workshop. B. Berman suggested PIAC meet on the same day that OMSAP meets to deliberate on monitoring plan revisions so that PIAC members can attend both meetings. A. Rex is not confident that the first workshop will be held in 2002 given the amount of preparatory work that MWRA has to do. Since the date is not set in stone, it would be difficult to schedule a public forum on the same day. S. Estes-Smargiassi said that based on his experience it will be difficult for the scientists to summarize the workshop at the end of the two days and be able to commit to decisions. There needs to be some time between the workshops and any public meetings. P. Foley thinks there can be some flexibility with this. Perhaps we can have a public meeting by the end of the year, regardless of the review schedule. S. Tucker suggested providing a list of proposed changes to the monitoring plan to the public to get them interested in attending a public meeting. S. Genovese agreed in having a public meeting to update the public on monitoring, even if the technical workshops have not occurred, and give them a list of proposed changes that the public might be concerned about.

B. Berman liked MWRA's presentation to OMSAP on what they monitor, but MWRA should add more detail for each type of monitoring for a presentation at a public meeting. B. Berman thinks that could be covered by presenting the varying views of the PIAC members. B. Berman thinks that it would be better to have the public meeting after the two workshops. S. Tucker suggested PIAC draft a document about the monitoring revisions that members could distribute to their constituencies. P. Foley would like OMSAP to host a public meeting in two locations. She thinks that this time there will be more interest from the press. B. Berman suggested that a Boston public meeting be held at MIT or U Mass Boston. P. Foley thinks PIAC needs to make an outreach effort to promote the public meetings. She will set up a conference call to discuss what should be in the PIAC consensus document. B. Berman noted that OMSAP is to host an annual public meeting according to its charter. He noted that with the monitoring review schedule, it looks like the public meeting will be more than a year after the last one in October 2001 and wondered if that would be a problem. C. Coniaris did not think so.

P. Foley asked PIAC members what they thought about B. Beardsley's idea about MWRA posting their data on-line. B. Berman thinks if the results of the monitoring are on-line, at least in report form, then anyone can analyze the data. He asked if it would be possible for MWRA to post actual data. A. Rex replied that MWRA does not post their data on-line because of the complexity and size of their database, but all data are available to the public upon request. B. Berman asked if someone is reading a report on-line, if it is easy to request data from there. A. Rex replied that they can make it more obvious on the web pages that all data are available and who to contact. B. Berman thinks we should find out exactly what B. Beardsley meant by posting on the web. We want to make everything accessible to the public. M. Mickelson agreed to contact B. Beardsley.

S. Tucker thinks that the workshop agendas and summaries should be posted on the web. P. Foley agreed and suggested that the various PIAC organizations link to this page. B. Berman suggested Save

the Harbor/Save the Bay link to this page and also collect public comments. C. Coniaris will find out if there can be OMSAP email discussions on the OMSAP website.

ACTION: P. Foley will draft a PIAC consensus document about what the group would like to see presented at the public meeting. PIAC will meet via conference call to discuss the content of this document. PIAC suggests OMSAP host their annual public meeting after the two workshops, and to have the meeting scheduled at two locations.

OTHER TOPICS

B. Berman brought up the recent press on right whales and zooplankton. He was surprised and disappointed that the Center for Coastal Studies did not call Patty Foley to give the chair of a PIAC a “heads-up” before the press articles. Whenever there is a press release, PIAC members should try to contact one another. We need to keep each other informed. He appreciated that C. Coniaris kept us all informed. S. Tucker thought there was a lot of spin in the press. B. Berman agreed and said that the last time there was outfall press, Save the Harbor/Save the Bay worked with the Center for Coastal Studies to speak with reporters on the one-year anniversary of the outfall.

ACTION: C. Coniaris will find out if J. Montoya will present to OMSAP at their September 24 meeting.

P. Foley introduced the Boston University students in the audience. They are B. Berman’s students in a summer course that examines the history and public policy of the Boston Harbor clean-up. P. Foley invited the students to ask questions. There was a discussion about MWRA water/sewer rates, the cost of monitoring, and the review of the monitoring plan.

S. Tucker is still concerned with OMSAP protocol when there is an exceedance. We have made progress in the information we get after there is an exceedance but he would like to see more information on who invokes OMSAP and their response.

ACTION: P. Foley and C. Coniaris will report back to PIAC on the protocol of OMSAP response when there is an MWRA exceedance.

ADJOURNED

MEETING HANDOUTS:

- Agenda
- July 2002 OMSAP/PIAC/IAAC membership lists
- April 2002 draft PIAC minutes
- MWRA information briefings and copies of presentations

Summary prepared by C. Coniaris. Post-meeting comments are included in [brackets]. All such comments have been inserted for clarification only. They do not, nor are they intended to, suggest that such insertions were part of the live meeting components and have been expressly set-off so as to avoid such inference.

PUBLIC INTEREST ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PIAC) MEETING
September 24, 2002, 2:30 to 4:30 PM, MADEP Boston
FINAL MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

Members Present: Patty Foley, Save the Harbor/Save the Bay (chair); Bruce Berman, SH/SB (alternate); Ed Bretschneider, Wastewater Advisory Committee; Marianne Farrington, New England Aquarium; Joe Favaloro, MWRA Advisory Board; Maggie Geist, Association to Preserve of Cape Cod; Sal Genovese, Safer Waters in Massachusetts; Tara Nye, APCC (alternate); and Steve Tucker, Cape Cod Commission (alternate).

Observers: Cathy Coniaris, MADEP; Ben Kelly, Save the Harbor/Save the Bay; Steve Lipman, MADEP; Mike Mickelson, MWRA; Andrea Rex, MWRA; and Jonathan Yeo, MWRA.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

1. PIAC approved the July 15, 2002 minutes with one amendment. PIAC members that are alternates will be noted in the attendance section.
2. A. Rex agreed to provide a list of which monitoring activities answer which questions, and at what cost. She will also provide copies of the 1991 ambient monitoring plan to PIAC.
3. PIAC hopes that out the monitoring review comes an easily understandable explanation of what monitoring will be kept, changed, and/or deleted.
4. PIAC requested that information on MWRA's proposed fast track changes be provided to PIAC as soon as possible. PIAC may have a conference call once that information is provided.
5. PIAC recommends that the next OMSAP public workshop either piggyback with another event to improve attendance, or take on another format, such as a web discussion, or radio call-in program.

MINUTES

REVIEW OF DRAFT JULY 15, 2002 MINUTES

PIAC members were asked if they had any comments on the draft July PIAC minutes. J. Favaloro expressed concern about how PIAC opinions are portrayed to OMSAP. P. Foley reminded J. Favaloro that PIAC's charge is to represent the public and to hear from all who take the time and devote the energy to participating at OMSAP and PIAC meetings. P. Foley went on to say that over the course of her tenure as Chair, she has provided ample opportunities for PIAC members to participate in the group's work regardless of whether they attend meetings or not. Specifically, there have been several occasions when she has convened conference calls (at SavetheHarbor/Save the Bay's expense) for PIAC members to discuss outstanding issues and to prepare for quarterly meetings. Unfortunately, attendance and participation on conference calls has been sporadic.

She went on to say that as OMSAP and PIAC undertake the review of current monitoring practices and protocols, she hopes that attendance will increase. And, of course, she anticipates that she will call for recorded votes from individual PIAC members.

J. Favaloro then brought up meeting locations and how difficult it is for him to make it to meetings in Woods Hole. C. Coniaris explained that meetings are usually split between Boston and Woods Hole. More than half of OMSAP is from the Woods Hole area, or Rhode Island and meetings in Woods Hole are convenient for them. B. Berman suggested that J. Favaloro send an alternate to the meetings that he cannot attend. E. Bretschneider liked the idea of having conference calls to communicate on a

regular basis. P. Foley agreed, but unfortunately, conference calling with the entire committee is costly and MADEP will not cover the expense.

ACTION: PIAC approved the July 15, 2002 minutes with one amendment. PIAC members that are alternates will be noted in the attendance section.

REVIEW OF OMSAP MEETING

C. Coniaris summarized the OMSAP meeting [see OMSAP September 2002 minutes]. S. Tucker brought up his concern about PIAC not being invited to the EPA/MADEP/MWRA meeting to discuss the August 2002 total suspended solids (TSS) exceedances. S. Lipman explained that because of the nature of the exceedances, the regulatory agencies were reviewing the incident that caused the TSS exceedances to see if any enforcement actions were necessary. Therefore, inter-agency policy deliberation meetings such as the one last week are closed to the public, until regulatory decisions can be made. S. Tucker said that he did not want to hinder the decision-making process; instead, he merely wanted to attend as an observer.

PIAC NOTIFICATION OF EXCEEDANCES

PIAC then had a discussion about notification when there is an exceedance. S. Tucker thinks that PIAC is notified in a timely manner, with good information, but he emphasized that it is important that they receive any technical information as soon as it is available so that there is time to review it in case the press call for further information.

PIAC INPUT TO MONITORING REVIEW

P. Foley began the discussion by asking the group what information they need. A. Rex informed the group that according to the permit, the annual deadline to submit changes to the monitoring plan to EPA/MADEP is November 15 and MWRA intends to submit a package to the regulatory agencies. These proposed changes will be listed in the Environmental Monitor and will occur before the technical review workshops. The proposed changes are issues that MWRA thinks will be easy to understand, simple to decide on the course of action, and do not require a technical workshop for review. MWRA is still working on the proposed changes and will present them to OMSAP at their next meeting. S. Lipman added that there will be a formal comment period for the public. The length of the comment period can be extended beyond 30 days.

C. Coniaris handed out a list of incidents and exceedances and changes to the monitoring plan since the permit went into effect in August 2000. This list was requested during the last PIAC conference call. P. Foley then asked if the monitoring plan was posted on the web. A. Rex replied that if it is not, then she will make sure that it is posted. S. Tucker added that during the conference call, PIAC members discussed that they wanted MWRA to stipulate which monitoring parameters were likely to continue into the future. A. Rex pointed to the MWRA information briefing that looks at the monitoring questions. The effluent monitoring is in the permit and is not up for elimination. There are some parts of the ambient monitoring that are outside of the ambient monitoring plan, but within the permit (including: modeling, additional red tide monitoring, nitrogen report) that can't be changed either. What is up for review are items that are within the ambient monitoring plan, but not prescribed separately within the permit. We are in a position from shifting from looking at acute impacts to looking at more chronic questions so perhaps a different design is appropriate for that.

P. Borrelli asked if there is a one-line description of each of the various investigations that address each of the 43 questions. The monitoring questions will have to be approached differently when looking at acute vs. chronic effects. A. Rex replied that there is a table in the July 2002 information

briefing that summarized this. Also, the annual Outfall Monitoring Overview summarizes the entire program.

P. Borrelli said that when the Center for Coastal Studies realized that they were not seeing acute effects of the outfall with the nitrogen isotope monitoring, they had to reconfigure the project to look for more chronic effects. He thinks that when reviewing the monitoring, it is important to look at the percentage of cost for each of the monitoring parameters. P. Foley assumed that as part of the review, we would look at the value/cost for each of the programs. A. Rex agreed. P. Borrelli added that if there is not going to be an increase in monitoring expenditures, then we need to see if there is any shifting that needs to get done. B. Berman agreed that it's important for PIAC to know which investigations are the most important to continue and whether there is any redundancy in the monitoring. A. Rex agreed to provide a list of which monitoring activities answer which questions, and at what cost. E. Bretschneider noted that two words mentioned have different meanings: "value" and "cost". The highest cost is not always the highest value, and vice-versa. Other PIAC members agreed. P. Borrelli noted that when there is a shift to looking at chronic effects, there is always a shift towards more cost because of the long-term monitoring and finer scale needed. E. Bretschneider thinks it is important to look at value, to decide if money is being spent wisely. P. Borrelli thinks that identifying redundancy does not always save money because the same data may be collected by different agencies for completely different reasons.

S. Tucker thinks that each group on PIAC will want to comment on any proposed revisions, but it will be a challenge to sum up PIAC's view in one document that the majority of the members can agree on. P. Foley thinks that though PIAC as a group may not all agree, individual members are free to present their own views. B. Berman thinks that though PIAC members do not always agree, we have worked to hear and present the views of the individual members, and we may choose to continue to work that way.

J. Favaloro said that one of the things that he would like to see out of the review process is to hear in layman's terms how questions were answered and whether or not the monitoring for that question needs to continue. There needs to be a better layman's understanding of why parts of the monitoring should continue, be changed, or be stopped. This information needs to be clearly presented to the public. PIAC members agreed. A. Rex also agreed and thinks that this will be the challenge of the workshops because the workshops will be technical. M. Farrington offered to help with any "translation" of technical issues for the public. M. Geist said that when she looks at the questions, she can't relate them to specific programs that are underway, specifically those that have to do with the permit, those that trigger thresholds, and those that are part of the ambient monitoring. A. Rex described the 1991 ambient monitoring plan report that lays out the rationale for the monitoring. It lays out the monitoring questions and what MWRA should do to answer them. She will provide copies to PIAC.

S. Tucker requested that information on MWRA's proposed fast track changes be provided to PIAC as soon as possible. P. Foley agreed and said that once that information is provided, C. Coniaris and I will schedule a conference call, if needed.

ACTION: A. Rex agreed to provide a list of which monitoring activities answer which questions, and at what cost. She will also provide copies of the 1991 ambient monitoring plan to PIAC. PIAC hopes that out the monitoring review comes an easily understandable explanation of what monitoring will be kept, changed, and/or deleted. PIAC requested that information on MWRA's proposed fast track

changes be provided to PIAC as soon as possible. PIAC may have a conference call once that information is provided.

PUBLIC OUTREACH

PIAC discussed public outreach as it relates to the annual OMSAP public workshop. P. Foley reviewed the extensive public outreach conducted during the last OMSAP public workshop, and the poor public turnout. During the last PIAC conference call, those that participated felt that it was important to have the next OMSAP public workshop presented both in Boston and on Cape Cod. P. Borrelli thought that everyone did a wonderful job during the workshops last year, but the public turnout was poor. B. Berman noted that there were a few newspaper articles that came out the meetings. P. Foley thinks that the next OMSAP public workshop will give the public the opportunity to comment on the monitoring. P. Borrelli suggested that perhaps there are other ways to reach out the public, such as editorials and call-in talk shows. B. Berman thinks a call-in radio show would reach the most number of people, with a reasonable cost. P. Foley agreed and also thought an email discussion would also be useful. P. Borrelli suggested distilling the 43 questions into 12 questions that people really care about, for example, “what’s happening to the lobsters?” and “is Boston Harbor cleaner?”. J. Yeo said that if we are trying to attract an audience for a radio program, we have to do it very carefully. We should not go out to try to scare people. P. Foley agreed.

J. Favaloro thinks information to the public is good so that informed decisions about the monitoring can be made. He suggested that if the radio program does not meet the permit requirement, then perhaps a workshop can be piggybacked with another event to help audience-building (e.g. MA Municipal Association). PIAC agreed. P. Borrelli suggested the Fish Forums. S. Genovese said that Northeastern University’s Marine Science Center has periodic forums and open houses in Nahant. The attendance of the forums varies from 20 to 40 people, mostly students and older folks, whereas the open house attracts more people. He also noted that we could publicize along with the annual CoastSweep Week program.

ACTION: PIAC recommends that the next OMSAP public workshop either piggyback with another event to improve attendance, or take on another format, such as a web discussion, or radio call-in program.

ADJOURNED

MEETING HANDOUTS:

- Agenda
- September 2002 OMSAP/PIAC/IAAC membership lists
- July 2002 draft PIAC minutes
- List of incidents and exceedances and changes to the monitoring plan since the permit when into effect in August 2000
- MWRA information briefings and copies of presentations

Summary prepared by C. Coniaris. Post-meeting comments are included in [brackets]. All such comments have been inserted for clarification only. They do not, nor are they intended to, suggest that such insertions were part of the live meeting components and have been expressly set-off so as to avoid such inference.