

*Feedback on September 12, 2005 PRIME meeting at Tyler Place*  
28 Surveys Returned

**General Impressions:** (27 responded)

Excellent – 13	Very Good – 6	Good – 7
Average – 1	Fair – 0	Poor – 0

**Comments:**

- Great, well run
- It was a great opportunity to meet other researchers
- Great to see all the different research area ingoing in the bay. Good opportunity To make contact with other researchers
- The best information day I had for years
- It was great. There is a lot of useful information but should be more detailed
- Very pleased to attend and learn the wide scope of research in this area
- Very interesting to hear about everyone's work on the lake & Missisquoi Bay
- Useful Meeting
- Great to pull everyone together to share their studies. Important to have built in breaks for networking and further discussion.
- Great-always good to learn about other activities, seems to increase motivation & creative thinking
- Excellent. Cross discipline allows landscape and "bay" people to understand each other
- Excellent information-sharing & networking
- Excellent overview of work being done and good networking opportunity
- Good & valuable. Always important to see what others are doing
- While we obtained good general overview on a number of research projects, there was no study on the solutions/technologies for phosphorus reduction
- Great meeting-great food, definitely come back here next year
- Good collection of a wide variety of projects. Well done.
- Great and well managed
- Good to have an overview of what is going on in research and rehabilitating efforts
- Good value, useful, quick format
- Very valuable, to relate your personal topic to a broad scale one
- Good value, useful, quick format

**Suggestions:**

- More exchange: goal of producing something for collaboration
- Maybe: periods of questions and/or discussions between different sets of presentations
- None
- It would be nice to have time for follow-up questions so I think the meeting should be a multi-day event
- Ideal-not for science, but for mutual introduction
- Good to me
- Good

- Presentations were a good length but we need to for questions even at the expense of fewer presentations
- 10 minute structure allowed a sampling of the work that is going on
- Good as a one day event
- Good
- For the purpose of this meeting, good format-quick presentations and timely breaks
- 10 minute limit was tough but kept us focused
- It is good; short presentations were a challenge, but allow for a lot of presenters
- I like this rapid-fire structure very much-helps people get an overview of all the research activity
- Grouping presentations with breaks worked well
- Quality not quantity. Fewer presentations, more time for brief questions
- Keep the same structure and format
- Couldn't get enough detail in 10 minutes
- Little time for questions and discussion between presentations
- Great
- Good to do once every few years
- More time per presentation

Do you think that future meetings focusing on Missisquoi Bay would be useful?

Yes – 25      No – 0

**Format for future meetings:** (Some surveys responded with more than one answer)

A similar, one-day meeting with very brief presentations: 14

A multi-day conference with longer, more detailed presentations: 8

A series of small meetings, each focused on a particular research topic (separate meetings for Toxics, Community Structure, Nutrients & Algae): 8

Other formats:

- Two-day meeting with more detailed presentations
- One-day combo of short presentations and concurrent longer sessions
- Maybe expand then to include the rest of questioning the lake if there is currently limited info on Missisquoi Bay
- Add a 1-2 hour summary session/work session

**Time of year/season for follow-up meeting:**

Fall – 6

late Fall/early Winter – 8

Winter – 2

Winter/Spring – 2

Spring – 2

Summer – 2

Not Summer – 4

Other:

- Every 3 months, one per season at least
- Winter-then you can plan for cooperative projects during the summer
- End of field season and/or winter (after summer data is analyzed)

## **Suggestions regarding future research needs:**

### *Toxics:*

- Lake-wide assessment: we have no comprehensive toxics management plan for Lake Champlain
- Do they build up in food chain-what are their effects
- Methods development for toxics removal
- “new generation toxics”
- Sediments

### *Community Structure:*

- I see a need/use for a model that would link community structure and trophic relationships... and then examine/predict threats such as new invasive species such as alewife
- Increase outreach both in Quebec and VT
- Watershed group communications
- Change over a long period of time (pre 1990) if available

### *Nutrients:*

- I think it should have focused on nutrients when if why study the nutrients we getting the problem from its root. Source of this nutrient is important to know.
- Management impacts or inputs
- Better research/modeling of high flows that deliver large P-loads
- Research into actual loads of eroded stream bank sediments
- Monitoring/research of effectiveness of improving soil structure/aggregation for reducing P-transportation along with other related BMP's
- What food produces i.e. 8 tons poop/cow/yr.- we need to deal with this with Applied research
- P-recycling
- Innovative technologies for P & N removal, what are the current solutions; Legislation & Policy to oblige farmers to leave technologies applied on cows

### *Cyanobacteria blooms:*

- Triggers for blooms
- Forms of nutrients that are most available WEP, TP, STP-etc... Other chemical indicators that increase bio-availability ie. Plt.
- Bioimpact on species especially fishes and aquatic species like turtles amphibians (cold blooded)

*Other:*

- We should work towards a linked research agenda for these: community structure, nutrients, cyanobacteria blooms
- I think future research efforts should form on how cyanobacterial blooms may be linked to changes in the community structure at a variety of trophic levels.
- This would require many pages (referring to the toxics, community structure, nutrients, and cyanobacteria blooms)
- Use a development of methodology urging satellite images regarding water temperatures, currents, sediment logged or transport in Missisquoi Bay.
- Integrated monitoring
- Combine U.S. and Canadian studies prioritize goals-work together (referring to community structure, nutrients, and cyanobacteria blooms)
- Hydrodynamics
- Data availability: can we post available data file/paper PDF links on the LCRC webpage? Lists of authors and research areas?
- Links between research areas toward a more comprehensive approach at ecosystem level Include more wildlife before groups.
- Need to like the mechanisms that drive the water quality/algae problems in the Bay to the land management. We want to know what drives the seasonal problem. Is it seasonal loading or the watershed? Is it in Bay/dynamics/loading? Is it the nutrients in the river/stream systems? Knowing this would allow us to focus our control efforts and get those who need to buy in to buy in. (Other aspect is that we need farmers to do more, so we need to supply them with info re: source of loads)
- In lake methods for short-term relief (referring to nutrients and cyanobacteria blooms)
- Economic impacts of poor water quality
- Generally, I think that we should focus on finding the solution (new removal technologies) rather than presenting various research studies that do not really offer solution.
- Satellite imagery acquisition and re-visit schedule method to identify early *Microcystis* blooms and PO follow-up focused analysis of sediment transport & precipitation
- Big picture, connecting the different subtopics
- See outcome of Oct. 2004 meeting