**Sources Pathways and Loadings Workgroup (SPLWG) - Priority questions for the meeting**

**SPLWG Thursday May 29, 2014**

**Specific questions for each agenda item**

**Item #3.** Programmatic monitoring and modeling to address new focus for management questions

**Desired outcome**: Obtain feedback on and endorsement of the programmatic focus for WY 2016-19. Feedback on and endorsement of the synthesis report outline.

Q1. Do the programmatic elements from the previous five-year term remain appropriate for addressing the key management questions going forward?

* Do we have the right balance?
* Other program elements missing?

Q2. Is the proposed report outline suitable for synthesizing current knowledge and supporting recommendations and rationale for refocused monitoring/ modeling components?

* Any missing report elements?
* Other tried and tested analytical or interpretive methods?

**Item #4. Modeling program using the regional watershed spreadsheet model (RWSM)**

**Desired outcome**: Status update – what have we learned? Identify and prioritize next steps in relation to RWSM development and application.

Q1. Are the proposed immediate uses of the uncalibrated model reasonable?

* Are there other possible uses that could be considered?

Q2. Are the proposed model improvements for 2014 and 2015 the best use of available funds or are there are alternative improvements that should be prioritized?

* Are there are alternative improvements that could be considered?

Q3.Is the rationale for prioritizing watersheds with certain characteristics suitable to improve the calibration data to support use of the model for confident estimates of regional scale PCB and mercury loads in relation to possible TMDL revisions?

* Are there other possible rationale that could be considered?

**Item #5. WY 2015 monitoring design with a focus on MQ1**

**Desired outcome**: Receive advice and review on WY 2015 monitoring design

Primary Question: What is the most cost effective monitoring design scenario for MQ1: Identifying and ranking (high/medium/low) high leverage polluted drainages?

Q1. **Monitoring Design Scenarios**: Which scenario provides the best trade-off between scientific rigor (# samples, method inter-comparison), number of sites visited (maximum identification of leverage areas), and analytes included?

* Should other monitoring scenarios be considered to ensure data are useful for other management questions?
* Should the trace metals suite be added to the analyte list as an indicator of urbanization or source areas (generally, and specifically in association with PCBs/Hg)?

Q2. **Remote Sampler Methods**: Which method is likely to provide the most comparable results for PCBs and Hg? Are there other samplers we should use?

* To provide comparison between manual and passive designs?
* To provide comparison between sites of differing watershed characteristics?

Q3. **Site Selection** **Rationale**: What is the right balance of sites chosen based on each rationale in relation to the primary question?

* Are there other rationale that could be considered to ensure data are useful for other management questions?