From: Ron Gouguet
To: PETERSON Jenn L
Cc: Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; ANDERSON Jim M; Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; Chris Thompson; howp@critfc.org; Jeremy_Buck@fws.gov; Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; Robert Gensemer; Robert.Neely@noaa.gov
Subject: Re: Lamprey Tissue Analysis Proposal
Date: 11/27/2006 12:22 PM

I think a good argument is that at the upstream location it may be more useful to try to better understand Hg contributions from known upstream & natural sources rather than those for TBT, a new contaminant (60-80s?) with little or no "background" and few known 'shipyard/marine maintenance' sources (or am I out to lunch?)

PETERSON Jenn L wrote:
> I don't remember specifically talking about it, other than mercury would
> be a more useful contaminant to measure in the upstream locations than
> butlytin compounds - esp. since this would be the only upstream mercury
> measurement for the macrophalmia. This may be useful for an upstream
> background concentration for this metal. However, we will have mercury
> measurements for the ammocoetes.
>
>
> -Jennifer
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov
> [mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov]
> Sent: Monday, November 27, 2006 10:34 AM
> To: PETERSON Jenn L
> Cc: ANDERSON Jim M; Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov;
> Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov; Chris Thompson; howp@critfc.org;
> Jeremy_Buck@fws.gov; Goulet.Joe@epamail.epa.gov; Robert Gensemer;
> Robert.Neely@noaa.gov; Ron Gouguet
> Subject: Re: Lamprey Tissue Analysis Proposal
>
>
> I have one question about the proposal. The total mass of macrothalmia
> collected from the upstream (Elk Rock Island) location is 29 grams. This
> is just under what is needed for a complete analysis. In our proposal,
> we have proposed excluding butyl tin compounds. The LWG proposes
> excluding mercury from this sample based on the prioritization scheme
> presented in the FSP and QAPP. My question is why analyze for mercury
> over butyl tin compounds? Did you discuss this? I have no problem with
> deviating from the FSP if we have good rationale. However, if there is
> not a strong basis, I would prefer to not deviate from the approved FSP
> (style points).
>
> Eric
>
>
>
> PETERSON Jenn L
> <PETERSON.Jenn@d
> eq.state.or.us> To
> Jeremy_Buck@fws.gov, Chris
> 11/22/2006 01:49 Thompson
> PM <chris.thompson@EILTD.net>, Joe
> Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
> Robert.Neely@noaa.gov, Ron
> Gouguet <Ron.Gouguet@noaa.gov>,
> Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
> Robert Gensemer
> <rgensemer@parametrix.com>,
> howp@critfc.org
> cc
> Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
> Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
> ANDERSON Jim M
> <ANDERSON.Jim@deq.state.or.us>
> Subject
> Lamprey Tissue Analysis Proposal
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> Here is the final proposal for ammocoete and macrophalmia tissue
> sampling for your review. There was a mistake in the spreadsheet for
> ammocoete sampling at the south bank of RM 2.0 - we only have 11.2 grams
> there so we will only be able to do PCB congeners, dioxins and furans,
> organochlorine pesticides and lipid content. We will not be able to get
> metals and % moisture (additional 3 grams). However, I think we can
> assume a reasonable % moisture value from the other samples.
>
> -Jennifer
>
> (See attached file: LampreyAmmMacroTissueAnalysisProposal11_22_06.xls)
>