

Comments on the Posters

From Cadie Olsen:

- While panel 3 says the Source Assessment defined the magnitude of the sources, the magnitude of each source is not reflected in the rest of the panel, leaving one to conclude that perhaps aerial deposition is equal to groundwater contributions from contaminated soils, which we know is not the case.
- Also, rather than saying that soils are a source which could lead to confusion, change it to contaminated soils.
- Suggestion: Add a pie chart showing relative contribution from the various sources. An example should be available from the literature or similar studies from lake Washington and Toronto if our Source Assessment did not in fact create a PCB budget like the title implies.

From Richard Jack (Science Section - Toxics and Contaminant Assessment King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks) via Cadie Olsen

- Left hand side, I don't know what this sentence is trying to communicate? "It is difficult to precisely calculate PCB source contributions due to low PCB concentrations and natural variability (EPA*)" Perhaps rewording to say, "Contributions of PCBs from major pathways such as stormwater runoff, WWTPs, groundwaters, and aerial deposition are all highly variable which makes precisely calculating their relative contributions difficult."
- Left hand side under bioaccumulation: Bioaccumulation requires time, but uptake needs to exceed excretion as well. "Bioaccumulation occurs when an organism is exposed to a toxic over time." would more accurately be 'Bioaccumulation occurs when an organism accumulates a toxin faster than it can be excreted and thus concentrations increase over time as they get older.'
- Right hand side, not sure I would describe TSCA and the CWA as "conflicting". More that TSCA uses levels that might have appeared strict in 1975, but are widely out of date relative to modern toxicological understanding of sources. So perhaps, "Outdated regulations regarding PCB cleanup standards, the mobility of PCBs in the environment, and possibly ongoing inadvertent production make comprehensive action plans and achieving water quality standards exceptionally difficult."
- Middle, bottom part:
 - "Natural reductions" aka natural attenuation would be things like deep sediment burial to me – which is missing from these bullets and should be added.
 - Second bullet. The ban on production was enacted 40 years ago, along with restrictions on use, so I am not sure why this is "something happening over the last 20 years"? In keeping this separate from remedial actions and natural attenuation, perhaps instead say... "As existing products containing high levels of PCBs such as transformers, light ballasts, and caulks have reached the end of their useful lives and been removed from service, the pool of PCB sources to the environment has declined over the past few decades."
- I tried going to <http://spokaneriverpcbfree.org/> and there isn't anything past the front page. I am curious about what will be on the subpages and will check back in next month.