| Reviewer | Date | Relevant Document | Attachment? | Comment | FBE Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tom Brubaker | 6/14/2016 | Mare Brook Monitoring Plan | N | With the exception of MB2 and MB3, I believe all of the monitoring sites at Brunswick Landing are on property still under Navy control. MRRA has no issues or concerns with the proposed Mare Brook monitoring plan as regards MB2 and MB3. We will need to notify the operator of the golf course in advance of when monitoring activities will take place at those two site. Comments (if any) on monitoring activities at the other sites at Brunswick Landing will need to come from the Navy. | For future activities, we will give sufficient notice to the Golf Course for any monitoring activity. |
| Kristin Feindel | 6/15/2016 | Mare Brook Monitoring Plan | Y | Thanks for forwarding the monitoring plan. Jared and Forrest – I have attached some comments to the plan. The major edits are that we (DEP) plans to do the bug enclosures at MB21 (Richards Dr) and MB24 (Baribeau), not MB8 (on Navy property), since we really want to try to isolate whether the issue is the water quality or habitat (including sediment) in the upper watershed. Also, for the continuous logger monitoring for the golf course site, we may do MB3 since it is non-tidal, rather than MB2 if the site has enough water and access. Does anyone have a good contact for the golf course to ask about gaining access? Bob, I have left a voicemail asking about access to the Navy property sites. | Comments regarding the Bug Enclosures are listed below (Row 9). If there is enough water and access is possible, continuous monitoring at MB2 makes sense. Monitoring at this site was not possible in June because of landowner contact time but will be considered for August. All feedback in the attached document from K. Feindel has been incorporated into the final plan. |
| David Page | 6/15/2016 | Mare Brook Monitoring Plan | N | Given the realities of the resources available, I think the plan is OK, with reservations. My big problem is the lack of Macroinvertebrate Enclosure coverage for of the Merriconeag Branch of the watershed (Site MB7). This is particularly important if Site MB8 is dropped from this part of the study. Inclusion of MB7 would recognize that the Mare Creek watershed has 2 overall elements, MB10-MB24&MB8 and MB4-MB7. MB9 integrates inputs from both branches. Doing Macroinvertebrate Enclosure sampling at MB21 and MB24 as recommended by DEP, tells us about the residential component, but nowhere else. I am not sure how one can do a more comprehensive job with only 3 Macroinvertebrate Enclosure sites. | See row 9 below. |
| Bob LeClerc | 6/16/2016 | Mare Brook Monitoring Plan | N | No Comments | |
| Matt Craig | 6/16/2016 | Mare Brook Monitoring Plan | N | My understanding is that monitoring for use of this system by diadromous species is outside the scope of this effort (and anyway, the timing doesn't work), so put this in the parking lot, but at some point down the road it would be interesting to assess whether the system is being used by diadromous species such as smelt, eels, river herring, etc. On that note, I recently learned that the system is one of several coastal streams around the state that is being monitored by IFW & partners for sea run trout. | FBE agrees with Matt that monitoring of diadromous fish species would provide important information regarding the stream however, we agree that it is outside of the scope for this project. We encourage the committee to consider additional funding to improve upon work in the estuary. |
| Chris Baldwin | 6/17/2016 | Mare Brook Monitoring Plan | Y | See attachment | We have updated the plan to read "specific conductance". DEP chose to conduct monitoring in June (see response from J. Dennis below). We have addressed the inconsistencies with the Macroinvertebrate Enclosures. There will be five individual enclosures at each stream site and the reference stream (total 15 enclosures). The Topsham Fair Ground Stream was chosen as the reference stream because it has consistently met class and is geographically positioned near Mare Brook. We are working on identifying the species to be used as an indicator but it has not been determined. Any input on this is welcome. We will be completing daily in-chamber spot checks and loggers will be deployed in the stream as available but may not be directly linked to each site. While we agree that more sites would be great, we do not have the resources at this time. |
| Jeff Dennis | 6/17/2016 | Mare Brook Monitoring Plan - Response to C. Baldwin | N | Chris, I hear what you're saying but the low flows we're having in small streams right now in southern Maine are lower than August flows have been in some recent years, so, at least for parameters like conductance, which will likely max out during the lowest flows, we should probably take advantage of the low flow while we have it. Dissolved oxygen is a little trickier, because, if we have low base flow in August, the water may be warmer, and that would be the most stressful condition for D.O. I think we should monitor D.O. and conductance now and, if August is reasonably dry, try to get August data as well. | We agree with this decision. |
| Kristin Feindel | 6/23/2016 | Mare Brook Monitoring Plan - Response to D. Page | N | After some discussion about the bug enclosure locations with Jeff, we agree that doing an enclosure on Merriconeag (MB7), versus just below Baribeau (MB24) makes sense. Hopefully it would help confirm what we think about the water quality on Merriconeag – that it is likely okay, but the sediments are toxic. We would lose learning if there is a difference in water quality between Richards (MB21) and Baribeau (MB24), but it may be worth it to have the information about Merriconeag. While having enclosures at more sites would be great, unfortunately it is beyond our budget and time at this time. | FBE agrees that having bug enclosures in both Merriconeag Stream and the Upper Reach will highlight potential effects of WQ vs habitat. We plan on using the Topsham Fair Grounds Stream as a reference. We agree that more sites would be better but are outside of the budget and time for this season. |