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## What we've learned about HABs in New York

## Scott Kishbaugh CSLAP Director, NYSDEC



## So what do they actually do?

Every other week CSLAP volunteers
Collect open water HAB samples
Filter in field and send raw water and filter to labs
Complete field form showing extent, type, spatial coverage


When blooms are observed
Collect shoreline scum sample Send raw water directly to ESF Complete field form
Send periodic updates to DEC

## And what about ESF and UFI?

Samples received almost every day by ESF and UFI
ESF: raw open water and filters, and shoreline bloom samples
ESF: analyzes Total and BG chlorophyll (fluoroprobe)
ESF: analyzes for several toxins and microscopies (high chl)
UFI: analyzes phycocyanin and total fluorometric chlorophyll

Reports to DEC
Fluoroprobe results daily
Toxin results in batches
Fluorometric results Fridays


## And then what does DEC do.....?

Waterbodies with Blue-Green Algae Notices

| Map Number | Waterbody Name | County | Status | Extent of bloom | Status Date | Type of Sample | Change in Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Allegheny Reservoir+ | Cattaraugus | Confirmed | Large localized | 10/7/2013 | Lab sample | Updated listing |
| 2 | Beaver Dam Lake | Orange | Confirmed | Small localized | 10/7/2013 | Lab sample | Updated listing |
| 3 | Browns Pond | Orange | Suspicious | Widespread | 10/3/2013 | Visual | No change |
| 4 | Burden Lake | Rensselaer | Confirmed | Small localized | 9/29/2013 | Lab sample | No change |



All ESF/UFI reports forwarded to DEC and DOH regions and lake assn (sampler) within 12 hours of receipt

Weekly webpage update of all credible HAB reports from CSLAP, ESF, Stonybrook, public

## How we make the call

DEC HAB website characterizes conditions "Suspicious"

Visual evidence of BGA bloom
No lab sample to verify
"Confirmed"
Visual evidence of BGA bloom AND
BG chlorophyll (FP) > 30 OR
Microscopics $=$ BGA dominance
"Confirmed with high toxins"
Confirmed BGA bloom AND
MC-LR shore sample > 20 OR
MC-LR open water > 10
Updated weekly with new information All sampled waterbodies cited on page
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## So what have we learned



Where? (in the state)

What? (kind of algae)

How? (much has it changed?)

When? (are they occurring)

Why?

## Where?

## A short (but very long) history of HABs in NYS

3.5 billion years ago they were captured in the fossil record

400 years ago, Samuel Champlain's description of Oneida Lake suggested algae blooms were common on the lake

200 years later, James Fenimore Cooper observed "lake blossoms" on the lake, now described as "blooms"

Similar blooms were documented on a number of the lakes by biologists during the New York Conservation Department Biological Surveys from 1924-1938


## Fast forward to "yesterday"



Lake Champlain 2008

## Lake algae may be killing animals, birds

Authorities: Don't fish or touch the water. Water samples to be tested.
By Delen Goldberg Staff writer
A dog climbed out of Lake Neatahwanta in Fulton after a short swim Tuesday night, broke into convulsions and began vomiting.

While the toxin is unlikely to be fatal to humans, officials said high levels of the poison can cause liver and nervous system damage.
"Until we find out for sure what is going on, it's better that people stay away, said Evan Walsh, associate public health sanitarian for the county Health Department.
Authorities posted signs Thursday on parts of the lake's


## Sodus Bay (August 2010)



## Honeoye Lake (September 2010)



## Lime Take 2008

## The Where

## (have blooms been found...?)



2011 Bloom Locations


## 2012 Bloom Locations

## 2013 HAB "Season"

Season = June thru October 77 waterbodies reported blooms

- 62 "confirmed" (out of 170 sampled waterbodies)
- 15 "suspicious"

57 lakes identified through DEC or other baseline monitoring programs


20 lakes identified by public reporting outside of baseline monitoring programs

## 2013: New York is a HABsy state...



## TOXIC ALGAE:



New York had 50 laboratory confirmed toxic algae warnings, an indication of how a strong monitoring system can reveal the true depth of the problem.
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## 2014 HAB "Season"

Season = June thru October 93 waterbodies reported blooms

- 74 "confirmed" (out of 195 sampled waterbodies)
- 19 "suspicious"

75 lakes identified through DEC or other baseline monitoring programs


18 lakes identified by public reporting outside of baseline monitoring programs

## Where they are: 2013-14 results Western NY and

 Finger Lakes(PA border to eastern edge of Finger Lakes)
44 lakes sampled by DEC and partners in 2013 or 2014
29 lakes reported HABs in 2013 or 2014
2014 TP in HAB lakes =46 ug/l
2014 TP in non-HAB lakes =18 ug $/ 1$
7 waterbodies cited as having "high
 toxins"
Large Finger Lakes generally do not exhibit regular HABs

## Where they are- 2013-14 results Downstate Region

 (Capital District to NYC and LI) 95 lakes sampled by DEC and partners in 2013 or 201466 lakes reported HABs in 2013 or 2014
Avg TP in HAB lakes $=45 \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{l}$
Avg TP in non HAB lakes $=21 \mathrm{ug} / 1$
27 waterbodies cited as having "high
 toxins"

## Where they sometimes are: 2013-14

## Central Region

(between FL, Adk, Downstate)
113 lakes sampled by DEC and partners in 2013 and 2014
51 lakes reported HABs in 2013 and 2014

Avg TP in HAB lakes =43 ug/l) Avg TP in non HAB lakes $=16$
 ug/l
15 waterbodies cited as having "high toxins"

## Where they aren't (definitely): 2013-14 Adirondacks

(includes $\mathrm{E}, \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{W}$ boundaries) 86 lakes sampled by DEC and partners in 2013 and 2014
10 lakes reported HABs in 2013 and 2014
Avg TP in HAB lakes $=24 \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{l}$ Avg TP in non HAB lakes $=9 \mathrm{ug} / 1$
2 waterbody cited as having "high
 toxins"
All HABs lakes in boundary (SE and NW of Blue Line)

## Come again, but not in so many colors?

| Region | \# 13-14 <br> Sampled <br> Lakes | \# 13-14 <br> HAB <br> Lakes | 2014 avg <br> TP HABs <br> Lakes | 2014 avg <br> TP non - <br> HABs <br> Lakes | \# Lakes <br> w/ High <br> Toxins |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Western and Finger Lakes | 37 | 24 | $46 \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{l}$ | $18 \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{l}$ | 7 |
| Downstate and Long <br> Island | 95 | 66 | $45 \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{l}$ | $21 \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{l}$ | 27 |
| Central | 113 | 51 | $44 \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{l}$ | $16 \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{l}$ | 15 |
| Adirondacks (region) | 86 | 10 | $24 \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{l}$ | $9 \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{l}$ | 2 |

## What do they (BGA) look like?

YES


Samplers asked to report on open water algae since 2011

Samplers asked to report on shoreline algae since 2013

## Reporting on blooms....

| Year | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# Open Forms | 864 | 777 | 581 |
| \% Open Forms | $92 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $83 \%$ |
| \# Shore Forms | 736 | 570 | 0 |
| \% Shore Forms | $78 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $0 \%$ |

## Let's go to the data (2012-14, open water)

| Type | N | FP_TChl | FP_BGChI | MC | Zsd | FIChl | TP | TN:TP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spilled Paint | 22 | 23 | 16 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 42 | 79 | 37 |
| Pea Soup | 52 | 23 | 17 | 0.8 | 1.6 | 36 | 63 | 47 |
| Green Streaks | 27 | 24 | 16 | 0.9 | 1.4 | 33 | 67 | 43 |
| Green Dots | 69 | 19 | 13 | 1.4 | 2.0 | 25 | 48 | 50 |
| Any of last 4 | 136 | 20 | 14 | 1.1 | 1.8 | 30 | 56 | 47 |
| Bubbling Scums | 26 | 160 | 3 | 0.2 | 2.1 | 17 | 38 | 50 |
| Discolored | 194 | 10 | 5 | 0.3 | 2.4 | 18 | 34 | 55 |
| Duckweed | 15 | 6 | 3 | 0.3 | 2.0 | 15 | 34 | 39 |
| Other | 22 | 10 | 6 | 2.2 | 2.8 | 21 | 30 | 64 |
| Any of last 4 | 263 | 27 | 5 | 0.5 | 2.4 | 18 | 35 | 55 |
| No blooms | 750 | 4 | 2 | 0.2 | 3.5 | 9 | 20 | 104 |

"Classic" image samples show higher BGA, TP, MC; lower N:P and clarity

Some "non" BGA image samples show higher total algae (bubbling scums), higher toxins ("other")

## But sometimes a few samples skew results

| Type | N | \%FP | \%FP | \%FP | \%FP |  | \%MC>20 | FlChl |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | TChl $>50$ | BG > 30 | BG $>20$ | BG>15 | \%MC>4 |  | Zsd<1.2 | >30 | TP>20 |
| Spilled Paint | 22 | 5\% | 14\% | 36\% | 45\% | 9\% | 0\% | 45\% | 45\% | 73\% |
| Pea Soup | 52 | 10\% | 21\% | 37\% | 40\% | 4\% | 2\% | 40\% | 40\% | 69\% |
| Green Streaks | 27 | 4\% | 19\% | 33\% | 41\% | 7\% | 0\% | 48\% | 33\% | 74\% |
| Green Dots | 69 | 4\% | 14\% | 23\% | 29\% | 4\% | 1\% | 29\% | 26\% | 52\% |
| Any of last 4 | 136 | 7\% | 15\% | 26\% | 32\% | 4\% | 1\% | 33\% | 30\% | 58\% |
| Bubbling Scums | 26 | 4\% | 4\% | 4\% | 8\% | 0\% | 0\% | 38\% | 19\% | 0\% |
| Discolored | 194 | 3\% | 2\% | 6\% | 7\% | 1\% | 0\% | 25\% | 18\% | 0\% |
| Duckweed | 15 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 7\% | 7\% | 0\% |
| Other | 22 | 5\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 5\% | 5\% | 23\% | 18\% | 0\% |
| Any of last 4 | 263 | 3\% | 4\% | 8\% | 9\% | 1\% | 0\% | 26\% | 17\% | 0\% |
| No blooms | 750 | 0\% | 1\% | 2\% | 2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 10\% | 6\% | 29\% |

"BGA" blooms more likely to present "moderate" to "high" risk for toxins and blue green algae

Big three appear to be "spilled paint", "pea soup" and "green streaks"

## What about where people swim?

| Type | N | FP_TChl | FP_BGChI | NC |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spilled Paint | 72 | 22824 | 22604 | 381.1 |  |
| Pea Soup | 67 | 19379 | 19076 | 165.9 |  |
| Green Streaks | 62 | 3177 | 3055 | 131.1 |  |
| Green Dots | 95 | 1635 | 1460 | 66.3 |  |
| Any of last 4 | 224 | 8875 | 8676 | 129.3 |  |
| Bubbling Scums | 15 | 1580 | 1306 | 1.7 |  |
| (and |  |  |  |  |  |
| Discolored | 5 | 228 | 207 | 48.7 |  |
| Duckweed | 3 | 210 | 59 | 185.3 | $?$ |
| Other | 9 | 392 | 139 | 2.0 |  |
| Any of last 4 | 51 | 600 | 459 | 19.9 |  |
| No blooms | 12 | 65 | 42 | 23.1 |  |

Wow! HUGE numbers!

Must be mis ID

Apparent very high total and BGA levels and toxins in all samples

Some "non" BGA image samples show higher total algae (bubbling scums), higher toxins ("other")
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## But sometimes a few samples skew results

| Type | \%FP |  | \%FP | \%FP | \%FP | \%MC>4 | \%MC>20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | TChl >50 | BG >30 | BG >20 | BG>15 |  |  |
| Spilled Paint | 72 | 83\% | 83\% | 83\% | 83\% | 57\% | 46\% |
| Pea Soup | 67 | 93\% | 87\% | 90\% | 90\% | 46\% | 30\% |
| Green Streaks | 62 | 71\% | 74\% | 76\% | 77\% | 40\% | 27\% |
| Green Dots | 95 | 46\% | 43\% | 44\% | 45\% | 22\% | 12\% |
| Any of last 4 | 224 | 64\% | 62\% | 64\% | 65\% | 34\% | 22\% |
| Bubbling Scums | 15 | 40\% | 20\% | 27\% | 40\% | 7\% | 0\% |
| Discolored | 5 | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 20\% |
| Duckweed | 3 | 100\% | 67\% | 67\% | 67\% | 67\% | 33\% |
| Other | 9 | 44\% | 33\% | 33\% | 44\% | 11\% | 0\% |
| Any of last 4 | 51 | 47\% | 35\% | 39\% | 45\% | 20\% | 8\% |
| No blooms | 12 | 17\% | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | 42\% | 33\% |

"Spilled paint blooms are most toxic; pea soup have highest BGA

Some "non BGA" blooms might still have BGA and toxins

## Change from month to month

| Month | FP_TChl | FP_BGChl | $\begin{gathered} \% F P \\ \text { TChl }>50 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \% F P \\ B G>30 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \%FP BG } \\ >20 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \%FP } \\ \text { BG>15 } \end{gathered}$ | \%MC>4 | \%MC>20 | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| May | 9 | 3 | 0\% | 4\% | 8\% | 12\% | 0\% | 0\% | 26 |
| June | 4 | 1 | 1\% | 1\% | 2\% | 3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 414 |
| July | 10 | 5 | 3\% | 4\% | 6\% | 8\% | 1\% | 0\% | 661 |
| Aug | 14 | 4 | 3\% | 4\% | 8\% | 9\% | 2\% | 1\% | 688 |
| Sept | 18 | 10 | 3\% | 4\% | 6\% | 7\% | 2\% | 0\% | 575 |
| Oct | 35 | 31 | 3\% | 4\% | 8\% | 10\% | 1\% | 0\% | 107 |
|  |  |  | \%FP | \%FP | \%FP BG | \%FP |  |  |  |
| Month | FP_TChl | FP_BGChl | TChl $>50$ | BG $>30$ | >20 | BG>15 | \%MC>4 | \%MC>20 | N |
| May | 21 | 15 | 4\% | 4\% | 4\% | 4\% | 6\% | 6\% | 57 |
| June | 1259 | 1190 | 31\% | 28\% | 30\% | 31\% | 9\% | 6\% | 137 |
| July | 1974 | 1724 | 44\% | 37\% | 39\% | 43\% | 21\% | 13\% | 234 |
| Aug | 4199 | 4016 | 54\% | 55\% | 60\% | 62\% | 28\% | 16\% | 299 |
| Sept | 10480 | 10317 | 56\% | 59\% | 64\% | 68\% | 39\% | 28\% | 197 |
| Oct | 6538 | 6189 | 48\% | 46\% | 48\% | 49\% | 40\% | 21\% | 71 |

Shoreline bloom

2014 Open Water Algae Types, CSLAP Lakes


Open water:

## Early: Green algae and diatoms

## Late: Blue green algae and other species

Shoreline blooms:
Increasing BGA levels into late summer with decreasing green algae and diatoms

2014 Shoreline Bloom Algae Types, CSLAP Lakes


## Change from year to year- all CSLAP lakes

Less Algae and Fewer blooms in 2014?

|  | Open | AvgTChl | \%TChl>50 | AvgBG | \%BG>30 | AvgMC | \%MC>4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | N | Open | Open | Open | Open | Open | Open |
| 2014 | 902 | 7.8 | $2 \%$ | 3.7 | $3 \%$ | 0.2 | $0 \%$ |
| 2013 | 905 | 16.9 | $3 \%$ | 7.4 | $5 \%$ | 0.5 | $2 \%$ |
| 2012 | 650 | 15.1 | $2 \%$ | 9.4 | $2 \%$ | 0.5 | $2 \%$ |


| Year | Shore <br> N | AvgTChl Shore | \%TChl>50 <br> Shore | AvgBG <br> Shore | $\% B G>30$ <br> Shore | AvgMC Shore | \%MC>4 <br> Shore |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014 | 460 | 5492 | 45\% | 5370 | 44\% | 35 | 13\% |
| 2013 | 473 | 3471 | 43\% | 3166 | 43\% | 144 | 29\% |
| 2012 | 79 | 3482 | 72\% | 3378 | 59\% | 96 | 35\% |

## Change from year to year- index lakes

| Year | Open | N | AvgTChl | OpTChl>50 | AvgBG <br> Open | \%BG <br> Open | AvgMC <br> Open | OMC $>4$ <br> Open |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014 | 151 | 6.2 | $1 \%$ | 4.0 | $3 \%$ | 0.2 | $0 \%$ |  |
| 2013 | 177 | 7.0 | $3 \%$ | 3.3 | $4 \%$ | 0.6 | $3 \%$ |  |
| 2012 | 137 | 6.6 | $1 \%$ | 4.9 | $5 \%$ | 0.6 | $4 \%$ |  |


| Year | Shore | AvgTChIS |  | \%TChl>50 | AvgBG |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| hore | Shore | Shore | \%BG>30 <br> Shore | AvgMC <br> Shore | \%MC $>4$ <br> Shore |  |  |
| 2014 | 168 | 5167 | $35 \%$ | 5146.101 | $39 \%$ | 2.5 | $4 \%$ |
| 2013 | 134 | 1553 | $45 \%$ | 1457.901 | $45 \%$ | 59.5 | $47 \%$ |
| 2012 | 14 | 2812 | $57 \%$ | 2662.114 | $50 \%$ | 458.6 | $43 \%$ |

## Which toxins? (2014)

## Hepatotoxins



Neurotoxins

| Anatoxin-a | N | $\%$ Detectable | $\%>1 \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{I}$ | $\%>4 \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{I}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Open | 924 | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Shore | 447 | $6 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ |

## Can we detect HABs early?

Fluoroprobe used to identify appx. algal density
Data received by DEC within 24 hrs receipt
Fluoroprobe underestimates algae density near "bloom" range FP of $30 \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{l}$ in open water may underestimate "blooms"


## What might be better....



10-15 ug/l BG chlorophyll and $30 \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{l}$ total chlorophyll measured thru fluoroprobe might be better measure of extracted chlorophyll $=30$ ug/l BG chlorophyll and 50 ug/l total chlorophyll, respectively

## What do we still have to learn?

Why?


School for the Mechanically Declined

## Why why?

Open water blooms with "moderate" toxin risk generally limited to chlorophyll > 15

Likelihood of shoreline blooms increases 5x as chlorophyll increases from 5 to $20 \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{l}$

Why are blooms occurring in this (0-15 ug/l) range?
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