

# EROS Minutes

## Spring 2006 Riverside CA

### Tuesday afternoon:

- 1.) Orientation brochure.
  - a. The purpose is to provide basic information about how the Program works, the structure of the Technical and Subcommittees, and how to influence the direction of the program.
  - b. We really need to get at least a V1.0 together by the Fall meeting
  - c. Volunteers?

*Action: Kristy Morris and Maggie Kerchner will draft a 3-fold brochure, which will contain the following pages:*

*Cover*

*Intro and brief history*

*SubCommittees – how to get involved*

*Meeting structure and website info*

*Journal articles/publications and committee officers*

*Back cover with upcoming events.*

*A first draft will be provided to EROS by mid-June for their comments. A 2<sup>nd</sup> draft will be sent to EROS and discussed during the Exec meeting in July, with the expectation of a final version ready for the Fall meeting in Norfolk.*

- 2.) Ideal Network Design
  - a. A document that would provide something of a road map for NADP over the next decade
  - b. The problem is I am out of my element and area of expertise. I/we need an efficient way of tapping into national expertise.
  - c. Proposal: A 1 or 2 day workshop hosting academic and agency scientists do devise a strategy for analysis of the existing network and future expansion to answer emerging questions and issues
  - d. Planning committee for Workshop including some funding opportunities.

*Lots of discussion focused on concern over the study results being used as justification to eliminate sites. Pam Padgett and Maggie Kerchner explained that this was not the intended purpose. In fact, due to the multiple effects of atmospherically-deposited pollutants, the establishment of additional sites is more likely to be the outcome. An analysis would be helpful to guide how many and where additional monitoring is needed. Chris Rogers proposed a modification that would alter the objectives of the project from a document to guide the program as a whole, i.e. a replacement for the 1985 network design, to a document, or series of documents developed for the purpose of outreach and education – here is where expansion of the network would really fill gaps in information. This would reduce the need to heavy-duty geostatistical analysis and enable us to build off of the “who’s using the network now?” work we have all ready done.*

*Action: 2 test issues were proposed:*

*Deposition in coastal regions*

*Ammonium deposition: urban to rural gradients*

*The proposal called for an outline of a study plan to be drawn up for each of the test issues by the Executive Committee meeting*

*John Sherwell agreed to review modeling efforts for ammonia deposition for evaluation of an urban to rural ammonia gradient. I may not have said this right—check with John.*

*Chris Rogers, Van Bowersox and Pam Padgett would work on the Coastal plan*

### 3.) Why not dry?

- a. 8-slide presentation on why determination of dry deposition continues to elude us.
- b. Proposal for release as an NADP/Forest Service product
- c. Modifications?

*Pam Padgett presented an 8-slide power point presentation identifying the difficulties in getting accurate dry deposition quantification. The intent of the presentation is not to excuse the lack of dry deposition measurements but to inform the general public of the complexity and uncertainty in getting those numbers. The discussion was generally supportive of the presentation's usefulness. Kristi Morris requested the addition of the resistance model as a means of explaining the components of atmospheric deposition and Chris Rogers, in a subsequent message, suggested that CASTNET should be mentioned since it does indeed exist to try to get at those elusive deposition numbers.*

*Action: Pam will make the changes – which will probably be a 9<sup>th</sup> slide combining CASTNET with the typical deposition resistance model – add the logos and send it out to folks who have requested it.*

## **Wednesday morning**

### 4.) Data mining/critical loads/soil measurements

- a. Opportunity within the rather disheveled national effort to devise a critical loads strategy.

*This was introduced in Subcommittee in preparation for the EPA sponsored meeting in Charlottesville in late May. Discussion was initially focused on the differences among the relevant agencies in approaches and need for "a critical load" or a means of deriving a critical load, and the general agreement that NADP has a long history of interagency unity, therefore could be a key player in a future national effort. Discussion also focused on ways to explore new ecological indices using NADP monitoring as the backbone.*

*Action: 1.) David Gay, Pam Padgett and ???? will attend the meeting and report back to the subcommittee.*

*2.) Critical Loads will remain a "standing session" at the Fall meetings, with specific talks relevant to the theme of the meeting.*

- 5.) Mountain and high elevation collection sites
  - a. The standard protocols for NTN and MDN often reduce completeness criteria for mountain sampling sites

*A recommendation out of the Joint Subcommittee meeting requested EROS to evaluate data products given changes in handling the snowfall data from NTN sites above 3000 meters. The discussion was generally supportive of a number proposals, both short and long term. The bottom line was to make sure that these locations made it on the maps. EROS did not make any specific recommendations.*

- 6.) Fall meeting
  - a. Maggie?
  - b. Recommendation from EROS for speakers

*Maggie Kerchner presented an overview of the program. The theme is deposition effects in urban and coastal environments. The group added the following suggestions:*

*1-The topic of critical loads should continue to be a focus (to some degree) at the Fall technical meetings. Kristi Morris will work with Maggie is designing time on the agenda for this topic.*

*2-Due to the release of the National Water Quality Monitoring Network design and the desire to incorporate atmospheric deposition with that network, there will be some time on the agenda for that topic;*

*3- It would be nice to keep Carol Kendall/Emily Elliott isotope research on the Fall agendas too;*

*4-Total mercury deposition should be given a full session;*

*5-Other ideas expressed include speakers from: the Baltimore LTER (and possibly the Phoenix LTER); the National Estuary Program's atmospheric deposition monitoring; Noreen Poor on Tampa Bay's research; Bob Howarth on his urban study; and Mark Zahniser's possible ammonia study in Boston.*

- 7.) Recruiting and encouraging participation by NRSP-3 funded sciences

*An information discussion on how NRSP-3 funds are distributed to Agricultural experiment stations. Given the funding level and accountability it is unlikely that NADP will achieve major participation by experiment station personnel, but the subcommittee did resolve to make an effort to invite local experiment station folks as part of the announcements for the Fall meeting.*

*In attendance: Pam Padgett, Suzanne Fisher, John Sherwell, Van Bowersox, Maggie Kerchner, Cari Furiness, David Schmelz, Amber Dichter, Kathy Douglas, Tom Butler, Rusty Day.*

*Joint meeting with DMAS for Ideal Network Design discussion*