

Points of agreement

- Focus on statewide condition through identification and sampling of the most popular fishing locations
- Screening survey, but generate information that can be used in consumption advice
- 303(d) listing is not a priority
 - regions can follow up at sites with hits to obtain the information needed for listing determinations
- Need representative sampling (either complete census or probabilistic draw) of the target population (the most popular river and stream fishing locations)
- Need specific strategy for salmon and steelhead (sample at select locations)
- This approach would be consistent with what we've done for lakes and the coast

Sticking point

- Region 5 would rather not spend monitoring dollars on many sites in the region that are already well-characterized for mercury

Options

1. *Include all popular sites (including ones with extensive mercury data) and all analytes*

Pros

- Comprehensive assessment on statewide condition with no qualifiers
- Establish a foundation for trend analysis as part of the long-term cycle of BOG surveys
- Resampling is valuable for trend analysis – some of best time series in the state for rivers are in Region 5 – recent data are 4-6 years old

Cons

- Does not address stakeholder desire for information on locations that have not previously been sampled in Region 5

2. *Include all popular sites (including ones with extensive mercury data), don't analyze mercury again at the sites with lots of data from FMP*

- Statewide condition report with asterisks

3. *Exclude sites with lots of data from FMP, have Region 5 select sites of high regional value*

Pros

- High value to region 5

Cons

- Incomplete assessment of statewide condition