# BOG Meeting Summary

July 28, 2008

In attendance: Michael Lyons, Bob Brodberg, Terry Fleming, Aroon Melwani, Dave Edwards, Jennifer Doherty, Vera Williams, Mark Stephenson, Autumn Bonnema, Karen Taberski, Dave Crane, Chris Foe**,** Jay Davis

**Summary of Comments About the Draft Illustrations**

**General comments**

- The target audience for these maps and this draft report is a technical one: Water Board staff and the Peer Review Panel.
- We also need to develop illustrations to communicate to the public.  We will think about these, but develop them after we nail down the more technical illustrations.
- Tables with the actual numbers will be what the Water Boards make the most use of.
- We should also think of illustrations to answer the question: what is the percentage of lakes where it appears to be safe to eat the fish?  Preferably, considering all contaminants at once.
- Take a look at the EPIC report
- Reverse MQ1 and MQ2 for this report.  The goal of this report is to provide information that is useful to the Water Boards for answering MQ1, not to try to answer it ourselves.
- Similarly for MQ3, the goal of this report is to provide information that is useful to the OEHHA, not to try to answer it ourselves.
- We discussed having a teleconference from 1:00 to 3:00 on Aug 11 to continue discussing presentation of the Lakes data.  Looking into this further, SFEI won't be able to have new maps by then.  Jay is proposing to move this discussion to August 25.

**Map 1**

- Use 350 mm bass for presenting concentration information, but explain this better in the caption
- Show data species by species
    - Develop a series of maps showing average concentration for each species by lake
    - Examine grouping multiple species together
        - TL3 and TL4
        - All species, but indicate different species in some manner
- Make it clearer that bar height is proportional to concentration
- Scope out combining SWAMP and FMP data for overlap lakes
- Eliminate ND symbols

- Show random, popular, and Region 4 lakes separately
- Use color scheme with red being high, green low
- Include rivers on the maps, but don't let them be distracting
- Include screening  values mentioned in the 303(d) listing policy

**Map 2**

- Use the sum of all reported congeners
- Include information in the caption on the maximum value reported

**Map 4**

- Indicate number of samples for each lake
- Produce series of maps for each pollutant using different threshold values
- A proposed list of thresholds to use is shown below:

|  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mercury | 0.07 (ATL 2 servings) | 0.15 (ATL 1 serving) | 0.22 (FCG) | 0.30 (303d) |
| PCBs | 3.6 (FCG) | 20, 21 (303d, ATL 2 servings) | 42 (ATL 1 servings) | 120 (ATL no cons) |
| DDT | 21 (FCG) | 100 (303d) | 520 (ATL 3 servings) |  |
| Dieldrin | 0.46 (FCG) | 2 (303d) | 15 (ATL 3 servings) |  |
| Chlordane | 5.6 (FCG) | 30 (303d) | 190 (ATL 3 servings) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Figure 1**

- Fix caption wording to match legend
- Add n to first graph
- Delete second graph
- Show percent of locations and percent of lakes
- Separate graphs for popular vs random

**Figures 4 & 5**

- Show percent of lakes in addition to % of area
- Find a way to simply communicate the take-home message for a non-technical audience.  Terry will work with us on this.
- Develop same figures for popular lakes