

**Special and Pilot Studies Ranking (July 5<sup>th</sup> 2007)**

Study	Title	BASMAA	Schoellhamer	BASMAA *	Schoellhamer *	RWQCB	Mulvey	Stein	Average	Median
#1	Methylmercury loading inventory for SF Bay	Medium	Medium	3	3	2	1	2	2.2	2
#2	Cross-sectional variability at Mallard Island	Medium	High	3	1	4	4	5	3.4	4
#3	Analysis of PBDEs in sediment and biota adjacent to autoshrredder waste storage facilities	Low	Low	5	5	5	5	4	4.8	5
#4	Guadalupe River Watershed Model Development	High	Medium	1	3	2	2	1	1.8	2
#5	Watershed specific sediment loads – a new estimate for predicting sediment quality	Medium +	High	2	1	1	3	3	2.0	2

\* Note Lester McKee converted these to numeric to facilitate averaging

**Dave Schoellhamer**

High: 2 (mine) and 5 (the tributary loading term is probably the second worst term in the sediment budget after the Golden Gate, this would help provide better estimates, but what I'd really like to see is the interested agencies supporting a larger comprehensive long term monitoring and study of sediment loads)

Medium: 1 and 4

Low: 3 (seems limited: one source, one contaminant)

**RWQCB (via Richard Looker)**

Here is the combined input from Tom, Fred, and myself.

#1 Methylmercury loading inventory for SF Bay (Rank 2 - tie)

#2 Cross-sectional variability at Mallard Island (Rank 4)

#3 Analysis of PBDEs in sediment and biota adjacent to autoshrredder waste storage facilities (Rank 5)

#4 Guadalupe River Watershed Model Development (Rank 2 - tie)

#5 Watershed specific sediment loads - a new estimate for predicting sediment quality (Rank 1)

**Eric Stein**

I would rank the modeling project #4 first, because it will provide a tool with the broadest applications for addressing your management needs. The next priorities would be the loading project - I suggestion, #1, #5, #3 (probably in that order) - I would rank the x-sec variability project as the lowest priority (although I still think it is important).

**Trish Mulvey**

top priority = #1 methyl mercury inventory = high

next = # 4 Guadalupe model = high if the SCVWD will match (otherwise low)

next = # 5 watershed specific sediment loads = high

then = # 2 mallard island cross sections = medium

bottom = # 3 auto shredder fluff = low

**BASMAA (via Jon Konnan)**

Title: Methylmercury loading inventory for SF Bay

Ranking: Medium

Comments: We suggest revising the proposal to clearly identify a) the target audience for this information; b) which specific management questions are the drivers for the information gathering; and c) a mechanism/stakeholder process by which the outcomes will be discussed and reviewed and who is supporting/facilitating that process.

Title: Cross-sectional variability at Mallard Island

Ranking: Medium

Comments: A nice study but reducing the uncertainty in our estimates of pollutant loadings from the CV does not seem high enough priority to spend 50K.

Title: Analysis of PBDEs in sediment and biota adjacent to autoshrredder waste storage facilities

Ranking: Low

Comments: Another nice study but not a high priority given that the Bay is not yet 303d-listed for PBDEs. Also, given the uncertainties in the draft PBDE CMIA report, it may be jumping ahead of the game to chase PBDEs in the vicinity of autoshrredder sites until we have a clearer sense of overall sources and dispersal mechanisms. It is possible that the results of this study would be similar to the CEP's PCB coring study that found just a general smear of somewhat elevated concentrations in "trapping zones" and not the hoped-for localized sediment hotspots.

Title: Guadalupe River Watershed Model Development

Ranking: High

Comments: This modeling could be useful to BASMAA, especially if coordinated with potential future drainage area-specific studies by BASMAA agencies to identify PCB sources and loadings (and mercury on an ancillary basis) and abate, per proposed MRP provisions. It should also be coordinated with monitoring and BMP testing by the SFEI Prop 13 project. If the HSPF method is selected, there is a lot of recent parameter development work that is better than the generic BASINS datasets (from the Bay Area Hydrology Model development and the Brake Pad Partnership). The main work of delineating sub-watersheds and allocating source areas would still need to be done so probably not much cost savings though. Also, we would like clarification on the "potential" match from SCVWD and what is Plan B if the funds don't come through.

Title: Watershed specific sediment loads – a new estimate for predicting sediment quality

Ranking: Medium (but could go higher with improved description of methods and outputs and better coordination with BASMAA reps)

Comments: This could be useful to BASMAA but a more detailed description of the methods and outputs is needed. Also, the proposal presumes some of BASMAA's needs, apparently mainly based upon review of proposed MRP provisions and TMDL language, but these needs and the potential for this study to help meet them should be confirmed and clarified with BASMAA reps.