# Pollutant Specific Management Question Details – First presented by Water Board Staff, SPLWG October, 2013

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Pollutant** | **High Leverage Pathways/Sources/Loading** | **Regional Scale Loads** | **Trends** | **Management**  **Effectiveness** |
| PCBs | The main focus now in MRP 2.0 is on implementation of projects to achieve load reductions. To support this, we need:   * Information (from modeling, monitoring, desktop studies) regarding PCBs-contaminated areas that can be the location for management actions. * Tools to estimate the possible benefits of such measures to help prioritize the candidate project sites * Analysis to help choose the best methods to apply to the candidate project sites * Need information to support long-range planning in non-priority watersheds   Can spreadsheet model be used in these efforts? | * Not high priority in short-term, except to complete spreadsheet model load estimates. * May be a need for sub-embayment scale load estimates. | Not high priority until we implement significant actions, at least in focused areas, and have more time for implementation to bear fruit. | **High Priority for PCBs**   * Need to develop approach for assessing this (both for localized areas and for LID implementation) * We assume the approach will involve data collection to assess benefit/effectiveness of those management actions and modeling to extrapolate management measures to areas in other watersheds to estimate impacts on loads. |
| Hg | Similar to PCBs but PCBs drive work.   * Plus emphasis on analysis/modeling to support long-range planning for LID in non-priority watersheds since contamination is diffuse and less amenable to control measures | May need as part of TMDL review. Where are we relative to allocation? | Not priority right now | Effectiveness of management actions for mercury load reduction. This may involve particular attention to benefit assessment of management action in less contaminated areas accomplished through LID-type strategies. |
| Selenium | Not much to do to support TMDLs in progress except for spreadsheet model load predictions. | | | |
| Legacy Pesticides | Probably not much to do since many Bay segments likely to be delisted except for certain legacy pesticide hot spots. | | | |
| Other Emerging | For CECs of unknown or low concern (those below levels of concern in Bay), screen for presence in urban runoff and identify sources to help design or refine management strategies. Generally, management will involve source control. | Coarse, screening level loads estimate using spreadsheet model useful for CECs of moderate concern, but high precision probably not necessary for envisioned regulatory strategies unless we encounter a CEC of high concern level in Bay. | Screen for trends in strategic locations to track potential increases in runoff of CECs currently below levels of concern in the Bay. | For those CECs for which a management action has occurred, we would trace, at regional scale, effectiveness of management actions. |
| Nutrients | There is a maturing nutrient strategy that will drive information needs for nutrients. There is a current interest in better characterizing loads, possibly using spreadsheet model. Efforts are already underway to better understand wastewater nutrient loads and some modest effort on the stormwater side. As nutrient strategy evolves, there may be monitoring/modeling needs for all four types of management questions. | | | |