



Assessment of Bioaccumulation in San Diego Bay



Steven M. Bay
Darrin J. Greenstein
Ashley N. Parks
Catherine Q. T. Zeeman

Southern California Coastal Water Research Project
SCCWRP Technical Report 953

[page intentionally left blank]

Assessment of Bioaccumulation in San Diego Bay

Steven M. Bay, Darrin J. Greenstein and Ashley N. Parks
Southern California Coastal Water Research Project

Catherine Q.T. Zeeman
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office

December 2016
SCCWRP Technical Report 953

[page intentionally left blank]

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank SCCWRP staff members Doris Vidal-Dorsch, Nathan Dodder, Dario Diehl, Patricia Gonzalez, and Justin Stuart for assistance with fish collection, sample processing, and data management. Thanks to Dr. Rebecca Lewison of San Diego State University for coordinating the collection of seabird eggs, and Dr. Jason Freshwater, USFWS volunteer, for many hours of assistance with processing egg samples. We also wish to thank the many participants in the Bight'13 Regional Monitoring Program and the Regional Harbor Monitoring Program for the collection and analysis of sediment and tissue samples. Special thanks to Chris Stransky and other staff at AMEC Foster Wheeler for sampling support in San Diego Bay, including extraordinary efforts to obtain benthic infauna samples and coordination of the fishing derby. Many thanks to the nearly 100 volunteer fishing derby participants that donated fish samples for this study. Additional support for sample collection and analysis was provided by the City of San Diego and Port of San Diego. Tissue and sediment chemistry analyses were conducted by Physis Environmental Labs and the City of San Diego Public Utilities Department.

Cover photo credits (top to bottom): AMEC Foster Wheeler, Lea Squires, AMEC Foster Wheeler, SCCWRP

This study was funded by agreements 13-075-190 and 14-032-190 with the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), in coordination with the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board.

DISCLAIMER

The findings and conclusions relating to wildlife risk in this report are those of the authors. As such, they do not necessarily represent the views of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Sediment-borne bioaccumulative contaminants have the potential to impair most of the designated beneficial uses for San Diego Bay. However, the ability to assess bioaccumulation-related impacts within the Bay is constrained by limited data availability and uncertainty in the approach to use for assessment and cleanup projects. Tissue contamination data for key elements of the San Diego Bay food web, matched with sediment data, are needed to develop an improved understanding of bioaccumulation relationships within the Bay and to provide updated information needed to assess the impacts of sediment contamination on wildlife and human health.

In 2012, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (SDRWQCB), the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project (SCCWRP), and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office (CFWO) developed a plan to address the bioaccumulation data needs for San Diego Bay. Funding to conduct these studies was received from the Water Board in May 2014 and January 2015. The overall goal of this project was to conduct integrated food web studies within three regions of San Diego Bay. Compilation and analysis of data from multiple studies, as well as additional sampling conducted under this project were used to accomplish three primary study objectives:

Describe bioaccumulation among key components of the San Diego Bay food web. Two major contaminant exposure pathways were evaluated in the study: bioaccumulation related to feeding on sediment-dwelling organisms (benthic pathway) and bioaccumulation related to uptake of contaminants in water column-dwelling organisms (pelagic pathway).

Evaluate risk to wildlife from contaminant exposure. Contaminant concentrations in the eggs and diet of five species of seabirds were examined: California least tern, Caspian tern, double-crested cormorant, western gull, and surf scoter (diet only).

Assess potential risk to human health resulting from consumption of San Diego Bay fish. Tissue contamination data for several popular sport fish, including spotted sand bass, California halibut, and pacific chub mackerel, were compared to consumption advisory levels developed by OEHHA (Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment).

Sediment and tissue samples were obtained from three coordinated studies. Sampling was conducted in 2013 as part of the Southern California Bight Regional Monitoring Program (Bight '13) in coordination with the Regional Harbor Monitoring Program (RHMP). The Bight '13 survey also included the collection of seabird eggs from five locations around the Bay. Additional sediment and tissue samples were collected in 2014 as part of a shallow water habitat (SWHB) survey designed to complement the 2013 sample collections. The SWHB samples were collected from water depths of 3 m or less in order to provide information on contamination and bioaccumulation patterns in areas frequently used as bird foraging areas and fish nursery grounds. Samples of five species of sport fish were collected for the study through a combination of targeted fishing and contributions from the public during a novel fishing derby.

The analyses were based on sediment contamination data from 65 stations in the Bay, randomly selected and representing three geographical regions: North, Central, and South. Additional sampling for biota was conducted at a subset of these stations in order to obtain samples of key

food web components: plankton, benthic infauna, and forage fish. A total of 209 tissue samples were analyzed for a suite of contaminants that included mercury, PCBs, DDTs, chlordanes, dieldrin, and contaminants of emerging concern (PBDE flame retardants and perfluorinated compounds).

The key findings from the study are summarized below by study objective:

Bioaccumulation among Food Web Components

- Biomagnification among food web components was evident for all major contaminant types evaluated: PCBs, DDTs, PBDEs, chlordanes, and mercury. Similar patterns among food web components were evident for most contaminant types, with the lowest concentrations occurring in the lowest trophic levels of plankton and benthic infauna (crustaceans, mollusks, polychaetes).
- The greatest bioaccumulation potential from sediment was observed for PCBs and DDTs, where all food web components had median wet weight-based concentrations above bay-wide sediment dry weight-based means.
- Median tissue mercury concentrations were below sediment levels for all trophic levels. However, the influence of sediment contamination on mercury bioaccumulation could not be determined due to differences in mercury speciation between sediment and tissue.
- Sediments in the North region of the Bay contained higher average concentrations of chlordanes, mercury, and PCBs. The concentrations of sediment DDTs were similar in the North and South, which were 2-3x higher than the concentration in the Central Bay.
- Tissue contamination in infauna did not appear to follow trends in sediment concentration for PCBs and DDTs, with the exception of PCBs in crustaceans.
- Within the same species, median total PCB concentrations in fish tissue were generally highest in the Central Bay, and lowest in the South. This pattern differed from the trend seen for sediment, where the highest median concentration of PCBs was measured in the North.
- The highest median PCB concentration (359 ng/g) was measured in six samples of deepbody anchovy from the Central Bay.
- Total DDT concentrations in fish were generally about ten-fold lower than PCBs. Median concentrations of DDTs were generally similar in the North and Central, which were approximately two-fold higher than the South.
- All fish samples contained detectable levels of mercury, but there was little variation in concentration among regions. The highest median concentrations were measured in spotted sand bass, barred sand bass, and deepbody anchovy.
- Seabird eggs contained similar concentrations of DDTs and PCBs. Caspian tern eggs contained the highest median concentration of most contaminant types.

- There was little difference between regions in contaminant concentrations in California least tern eggs.

Risk to Wildlife (Birds)

- Elevated concentrations of mercury in seabird diets and eggs warrant further study, but the likelihood of observing measureable adverse impacts is low. Risk to seabird adults via the diet is somewhat greater than potential impacts on embryos from egg contamination.
- Total DDT concentrations in seabird eggs exceed thresholds for adverse impacts on embryos of sensitive species for eggshell thinning and reduced nest productivity. Risk to adults from dietary exposure to DDTs is less. Waterbirds (seabirds and waterfowl) have intermediate sensitivity to DDTs, so the chance of detecting measurable impacts in the studied species is low.
- Total PCB concentrations in eggs indicate greater potential risk to embryos of sensitive species, relative to adults (from dietary exposure). Further monitoring is warranted, but there is a low likelihood of observing measureable effects in waterbirds.
- Risk from exposure to PBDEs, chlordanes, and PFCs was less than the other contaminants evaluated, and below levels of potential concern.
- Some risk of adverse effects from exposure to PAHs was indicated for birds that forage on benthic invertebrates.

Risk to Human Health

- Potential human health risk from seafood consumption was evaluated for five species of locally-caught sport fish: California halibut, pacific chub mackerel, round stingray, spotted sand bass, and topsmelt.
- PCBs are the dominant trace organic contaminant of sport fish in the Bay. DDTs, while still prevalent in fish, were usually present at much lower concentrations.
- Pacific chub mackerel and spotted sand bass tended to have the highest concentrations of mercury and PCBs among the species analyzed.
- Mercury contamination in the fish samples evaluated in this study posed the greatest potential risk to human health, with most of the regional mean concentrations falling in the range where consumption of no more than one meal per week is advised for sensitive populations (children and women 18-45). PCBs were also associated with relatively high potential health risk.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	i
Executive Summary.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	v
List of Figures.....	viii
List of Tables.....	x
Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	xiv
Acronyms and Abbreviations (Cont.).....	xv
Introduction.....	1
Methods.....	2
Sample collection and processing.....	2
Food web components.....	2
Seabird eggs.....	9
Sport fish.....	13
Chemical analysis.....	16
Data analysis.....	17
Egg fresh-weight correction.....	17
Contaminant summarization.....	17
Quality control.....	18
Bioaccumulation among Food Web Components.....	19
Data Analysis.....	19
Biota sediment accumulation factor.....	19
Normalized biota sediment accumulation factor.....	19
Bay-wide tissue and sediment contamination.....	19
Bioaccumulation by bay region.....	23
Plankton and benthic infauna.....	23
Fish.....	27
Seabirds.....	31
Bioaccumulation factors.....	34
Benthic infauna.....	34
Fish.....	35
Seabirds.....	35
Normalized Bioaccumulation factors.....	42
Benthic infauna.....	42
Fish.....	42
Risk to Wildlife.....	48
Representative Species and Exposure Factors.....	48
Profile for California least tern (small pelagic foraging piscivore, and species of conservation concern).....	49
Profile for Caspian tern (large pelagic foraging piscivore).....	51
Profile for Double-crested cormorant (pelagic and benthic-foraging piscivore).....	53
Profile for Surf scoter (benthic-foraging consumer of invertebrates).....	55
Profile for Western gull (mixed foraging carnivore).....	57

Summed concentrations of mixtures.....	58
Exposure Point Concentrations (in eggs and diet).....	59
Exposure Estimates (concentrations in eggs and daily dose rates for adults).....	60
Selection of Reference Values to Characterize Risk	61
Risk Characterization Protocols	62
Initial Screen	62
Refined Risk Characterization.....	66
Results and Discussion.....	67
Initial Screen	67
Refined Assessment.....	69
Mercury	69
DDTs	72
PCBs and PCB-TEQs	74
PBDEs.....	78
PFCs	79
Chlordanes.....	80
PAHs.....	81
Uncertainty Evaluation	82
Conceptual site model.....	82
Data, Contaminants of Potential Concern, and Exposure Point Concentrations	83
Exposure Assessment	84
Screening levels and TRVs (Toxicity Assessment).....	85
Risk Characterization	86
Summary and Recommendations.....	86
Risk to Human Health	89
Data analysis	89
Comparison to OEHHA guidelines.....	89
Tissue contamination	89
Sport fish consumption risk.....	93
Health risk summary	97
References.....	98
Appendices	105
Appendix A. Food web chemistry summary.....	105
Appendix B. BSAF summary	114
Appendix C. Normalized BSAF summary	131
Appendix D. Reference Value Selection.....	148
Background on thresholds for concentrations in eggs	148
Background on Toxicity Reference Values (TRVs; doses)	148
Effects and thresholds for mercury	150
Effects and thresholds for DDT and metabolites.....	151
Effects and thresholds for total PCBs, PCB 126 and TEQs.....	153
Effects and thresholds for total PBDEs.....	155
Effects and thresholds for PFCs (PFOS).....	157
Effects and thresholds for chlordane.....	158
Effects and thresholds for PAHs	159

References.....	165
Appendix E. Risk Characterization - Initial Screen Tables.....	171
Appendix F. Exposure Point Concentrations (EPCs), daily dose estimates, and HQs, assuming foraging is throughout San Diego Bay.....	178
Appendix G. Exposure Point Concentrations (EPCs), daily dose estimates, and HQs, assuming foraging is primarily in the Northern, Central and/or Southern Bay region	184
Appendix H. Sport fish composite information.	197
Appendix I. Sport fish tissue chemistry.	202

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Conceptual food web for San Diego Bay.....	2
Figure 2a. North Bay sediment sample locations for Bight '13 regional survey and Regional Harbor Monitoring Program (Bight '13) and shallow water habitat survey (SWHB).....	4
Figure 2b. Central Bay sediment sample locations for Bight '13 regional survey and Regional Harbor Monitoring Program (Bight '13) and shallow water habitat survey (SWHB).....	5
Figure 2c. South Bay sediment sample locations for Bight '13 regional survey and Regional Harbor Monitoring Program (Bight '13) and shallow water habitat survey (SWHB).....	6
Figure 3. Tissue sample locations for Bight '13 regional survey and Regional Harbor Monitoring Program (Bight '13) and shallow water habitat survey (SWHB).	7
Figure 4. Sport fish collection locations.	14
Figure 5. Summary of tissue contamination data for the entire San Diego Bay. The median is represented by the horizontal line, the box shows the interquartile range (IQR), and the whiskers flag potential outliers and extend to the furthest data point that is <1.5 x IQR from the box. Circles show individual data values. Dashed red line indicates median contaminant concentration in sediment (dry weight basis).....	21
Figure 6. Concentrations of PCBs, DDTs, and PBDEs in plankton and benthic infauna by Bay region. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.....	26
Figure 7. Concentrations of chlordanes and mercury in plankton and benthic infauna by Bay region. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.....	27
Figure 8. Concentrations of PCBs, DDTs, and PBDEs in fish by Bay region. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.....	29
Figure 9. Concentrations of chlordanes and mercury in fish by Bay region. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols. Sediment mercury concentrations for North and Central are not shown because they are higher than plot range (440 ng/g for North and 260 ng/g for Central). 30	
Figure 10. Concentrations of PCBs, DDTs, and PBDEs in seabird eggs by Bay region. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.	32
Figure 11. Concentrations of chlordanes, PFCs, and mercury in seabird eggs by Bay region. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.....	33
Figure 12. BSAF values for PCBs, DDTs, and PBDEs in benthic infauna. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.....	36
Figure 13. BSAF values for chlordanes in benthic infauna. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.....	37
Figure 14. BSAF values for PCBs, DDTs, and PBDEs in fish. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.....	38
Figure 15. BSAF values for chlordanes fish. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.....	39
Figure 16. BSAF values for PCBs, DDTs, and PBDEs in seabird eggs. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.....	40
Figure 17. BSAF values for chlordanes in seabird eggs. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.....	41

Figure 18. Normalized BSAF values for PCBs, DDTs, and PBDEs in benthic infauna. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.44

Figure 19. Normalized BSAF values for chlordanes in benthic infauna. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.....45

Figure 20. Normalized BSAF values for PCBs, DDTs, and PBDEs in fish. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.....46

Figure 21. Normalized BSAF values for chlordanes in fish. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.....47

Figure 22. Mercury concentrations (ng/g fw) in individual Caspian tern eggs collected from the South San Diego Bay Salt Works, 2013.70

Figure 23. DDT concentrations (ng/g fw) in individual Caspian tern, double-crested cormorant and Western gull eggs collected from the San Diego Bay colonies, 2013.....73

Figure 24. PCB-TEQ concentrations (ng/g fw) in individual California least tern and Caspian tern eggs collected from the San Diego Bay colonies, 2013.....76

Figure 25. Average total chlordanes and dieldrin concentrations (+ standard deviation) for San Diego Bay sport fish. Dashed line represents OEHHA Fish Contaminant Goal (FCG). NA = samples were not available for the species in the region. Samples with no error bars have an N of 1 or were below detection limit for all samples. All dieldrin concentrations were below the detection limit of 0.05 ng/g ww. The detection limit for chlordanes was 0.05 ng/g ww.94

Figure 26. Average total DDTs concentrations (+ standard deviation) for San Diego Bay sport fish. Dashed line represents OEHHA Fish Contaminant Goal (FCG). The solid lines represent the OEHHA PCB ATLS corresponding to one, two, or three meals per week. NA = samples were not available for the species in the region. DDTs detection limit is 0.05 ng/g ww. PCBs detection limit is 0.05 ng/g ww. Samples with no error bars have an N of 1.95

Figure 27. Average mercury concentrations (+ standard deviation) for San Diego Bay sport fish. Dashed line represents OEHHA Fish Contaminant Goal (FCG) for mercury for women 18 to 45 years and children 1 to 17 years of age. The solid lines represent the OEHHA mercury ATLS corresponding to one, two, or three meals per week for women 18 to 45 years and children 1 to 17 years of age. NA = samples were not available for the species in the region. Mercury detection limit is 0.01 ng/g ww. Samples with no error bars have an N of 1.....96

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Bight '13 and Regional Harbor Monitoring Program stations and sample types used for analysis of bioaccumulation relationships. Sample types: S = sediment, F = fish, I = benthic invertebrate, P = plankton, B = seabird egg, T = targeted station (non random). Samples located in Sweetwater Marsh were classified as San Diego Bay South for spatial comparisons.....	8
Table 2. Shallow water habitat survey stations and sample types used for analysis of bioaccumulation relationships. Sample types: S = sediment, F = fish, I = benthic invertebrate, P = plankton.	11
Table 3. Number of tissue and sediment samples analyzed for contamination.....	12
Table 4. Location of sport fish samples collected during 2014 SCCWRP rig fishing or 2015 fish derby and used for chemical analysis. Fish derby was conducted on 6/6/2015.	15
Table 5. Analytes and laboratory analytical methods for tissue samples.....	16
Table 6. Bay-wide contaminant concentration summary by taxonomic group.....	22
Table 7. Sediment chemical concentration summary for both random and targeted stations collected in three regions of San Diego Bay.	25
Table 8. Screening levels used to evaluate contaminant levels in seabird eggs collected from San Diego Bay colonies in 2013.	63
Table 9. Toxicity Reference Values (TRVs) - dose rates used to evaluate risks posed by contaminants in the diet to aquatic-dependent birds of San Diego Bay	64
Table 10. Initial risk-based screening levels for contaminants in the diet (aquatic biota) of selected avian species that forage in San Diego Bay.....	66
Table 11. Maximum contaminant concentrations detected (ng/g fw) in seabird eggs collected from San Diego Bay nesting colonies in 2013, as compared with most conservative (lowest) screening levels for adverse effects. Shading indicates exceedance of screening levels.	68
Table 12. Results of initial screen for contaminants of potential concern (identified by ✓) for avian species that forage in San Diego Bay, based on maximum concentrations in aquatic food web organisms (fish and/or benthic invertebrates).	68
Table 13. Mercury concentrations in seabird eggs collected from San Diego Bay nesting colonies, 2013.....	69
Table 14. HQs for dietary exposure of avian species to mercury in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay, based on mean EPCs and assuming birds forage throughout the bay.	71
Table 15. Total DDT concentrations (ng/g fw) in seabird eggs collected from San Diego Bay colonies, 2013.....	72
Table 16. HQs for dietary exposure of avian species to DDTs in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay, based on mean EPCs and assuming birds forage throughout the bay.	74
Table 17. Total PCB concentrations (ng/g fw) in seabird eggs collected from San Diego Bay colonies, 2013.....	75
Table 18. Dioxin-like PCB TEQs (ng/g fw) in seabird eggs collected from San Diego Bay colonies, 2013.....	76

Table 19. HQs for dietary exposure of avian species to PCBs (Bight '13 congeners) in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay, based on mean EPCs and assuming birds forage throughout the bay.	77
Table 20. HQs for dietary exposure of avian species to PCB TEQs in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay, based on mean EPCs and assuming birds forage throughout the bay.	78
Table 21. Total PBDE concentrations (ng/g fw) in seabird eggs collected from San Diego Bay colonies, 2013.	79
Table 22. HQs for dietary exposure of avian species to PBDEs in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay, based on mean EPCs and assuming birds forage throughout the bay.	79
Table 23. Total PFC concentrations in California least tern and Caspian tern eggs collected from San Diego Bay colonies, 2013.	80
Table 24. Total chlordane concentrations in seabird eggs collected from San Diego Bay colonies, 2013.	80
Table 25. HQs for dietary exposure of avian species to HPAHs in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay, based on mean EPCs and assuming birds forage throughout the bay.	82
Table 26. Fish Contaminant Goals (FCGs) and Advisory Tissue Levels (ATLs) based on an assessment of human health risk by OEHHA (Klasing and Brodberg, 2008). All values given in ng/g (ppb) wet weight. One serving is defined as 8 ounces (227 g) prior to cooking.	89
Table 27. Average chemical concentrations and standard deviations (SD) for sport fish collected in San Diego Bay (whole bay). N = number of samples used to calculate the average. N below Detection = number of samples below method detection limits. NA = data not available due to small sample size.	90
Table 28. Average chlordanes, DDTs, dieldrin, mercury and PCBs concentrations and standard deviations (SD) for sport fish collected in three different regions of San Diego Bay. N = number of samples used to calculate the average. NA = data not available.	92
Table A1. Chemistry summary for benthic invertebrates.	105
Table A2. Chemistry summary for plankton.	107
Table A3. Chemistry summary for fish.	108
Table A4. Chemistry summary for seabird eggs.	113
Table B1. BSAF summary for invertebrates.	114
Table B2. BSAF summary for fish.	118
Table B3. BSAF summary for seabird eggs.	125
Table C1. Normalized BSAF summary for invertebrates.	131
Table C2. Normalized BSAF summary for fish.	137
Table D1. Screening levels used to evaluate contaminant levels in seabird eggs collected from San Diego Bay colonies in 2013.	162
Table E1. Summary data on concentrations of mercury in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay, with exceedances/no exceedances (+, ++, or -) of observed effect-based dietary screening levels (NOAECs; SLs) marked for avian receptor groups represented by Surf scoter (1), California least tern (2), Caspian tern (3), Double-crested cormorant (4) and Western gull (5).	171

Table E2. Summary data on concentrations of total DDTs in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay, with exceedances/no exceedances (+, ++, or -) of observed effect-based dietary screening levels (NOAECs; SLs) marked for avian receptor groups represented by Surf scoter (1), California least tern (2), Caspian tern (3), Double-crested cormorant (4) and Western gull (5).
..... 172

Table E3. Summary data on concentrations of PCBs (Σ Bight '13 congeners) in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay, with exceedances/no exceedances (+, ++, or -) of observed effect-based dietary screening levels (NOAECs; SLs) marked for avian receptor groups represented by Surf scoter (1), California least tern (2), Caspian tern (3), Double-crested cormorant (4) and Western gull (5).
..... 173

Table E4. Summary data on concentrations of PCB TEQs in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay, with exceedances/no exceedances (+, ++, or -) of observed effect-based dietary screening levels (NOAECs; SLs) marked for avian receptor groups represented by Surf scoter (1), California least tern (2), Caspian tern (3), Double-crested cormorant (4) and Western gull (5).
..... 174

Table E5. Summary data on concentrations of PBDEs in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay, with exceedances/no exceedances (+, ++, or -) of observed effect-based dietary screening levels (NOAECs; SLs) marked for avian receptor groups represented by Surf scoter (1), California least tern (2), Caspian tern (3), Double-crested cormorant (4) and Western gull (5).
..... 175

Table E6. Summary data on concentrations of chlordanes in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay, with exceedances/no exceedances (+, ++, or -) of observed effect-based dietary screening levels (NOAECs; SLs) marked for avian receptor groups represented by Surf scoter (1), California least tern (2), Caspian tern (3), Double-crested cormorant (4) and Western gull (5).
..... 176

Table E7. Summary data on concentrations of PAHs in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay, with exceedances/no exceedances (+, ++, or -) of observed effect-based dietary screening levels (NOAECs; SLs) marked for avian receptor groups represented by Surf scoter (1), California least tern (2), Caspian tern (3), Double-crested cormorant (4) and Western gull (5).
..... 177

Table F1. Estimated exposure point concentrations (EPCs; ng/g ww), daily dose rates and hazard quotients (HQs) for dietary mercury (Hg) exposure by representative avian species, assuming they forage throughout San Diego Bay. 178

Table F2. Estimated exposure point concentrations (EPCs; ng/g ww), daily dose rates and hazard quotients (HQs) for dietary DDT exposure by representative avian species, assuming they forage throughout San Diego Bay. 179

Table F3. Estimated exposure point concentrations (EPCs; ng/g ww), daily dose rates, and hazard quotients (HQs) for dietary PCB exposure by representative avian species, assuming they forage throughout San Diego Bay. PCB concentrations = Σ Bight '13 congeners, and total PCB concentrations may be greater by a factor of ~1.27. 180

Table F4. Estimated exposure point concentrations (EPCs; ng/g ww), daily dose rates, and hazard quotients (HQs) for dietary PCB-TEQ exposure by representative avian species, assuming they forage throughout San Diego Bay. 181

Table F5. Estimated exposure point concentrations (EPCs; ng/g ww), daily dose rates, and hazard quotients (HQs) for dietary PBDE exposure by representative avian species, assuming they forage throughout San Diego Bay. 182

Table F6. Estimated exposure point concentrations (EPCs; ng/g ww), daily dose rates and hazard quotients (HQs) for dietary HPAH (PAH-HMW) exposure by representative avian species, assuming they forage throughout San Diego Bay.	183
Table G1. Estimated exposure point concentrations (EPCs; ng/g ww), daily dose rates and hazard quotients for dietary mercury exposure by representative avian species that forage in San Diego Bay, assuming foraging is primarily in the northern, central or southern region of the bay.	184
Table G2. Estimated exposure point concentrations (EPCs; ng/g ww), daily dose rates and hazard quotients (HQs) for dietary DDT exposure by representative avian species that forage in San Diego Bay, assuming foraging is primarily in the northern, central or southern region of the bay.	187
Table G3. Estimated exposure point concentrations (EPCs; ng/g ww), daily dose rates and hazard quotients for dietary PCB exposure by representative avian species that forage in San Diego Bay, assuming foraging is primarily in the northern, central or southern region of the bay. PCB concentrations in food web samples = Σ Bight '13 congeners, and total PCB concentrations may be greater by a factor of ~1.27.	189
Table G4. Estimated exposure point concentrations (EPCs; ng/g ww), daily dose rates and hazard quotients for dietary PCB-TEQ exposure by representative avian species that forage in San Diego Bay, assuming foraging is primarily in the northern, central or southern region of the bay.	191
Table G5. Estimated exposure point concentrations (EPCs; ng/g ww), daily dose rates and hazard quotients for dietary PBDE exposure by representative avian species that forage in San Diego Bay, assuming foraging is primarily in the northern, central or southern region of the bay.	193
Table G6. Estimated exposure point concentrations (EPCs; ng/g ww), daily dose rates and hazard quotients for dietary HPAH (or PAH-HMW) exposure by representative avian species that forage in San Diego Bay, assuming foraging is primarily in northern, central or southern region of the bay.	195
Table H1. Station identifiers and fish measurements for sport fish composites.....	197
Table I1. Sample identifiers and contaminant concentrations for sport fish composites.	202

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

>	greater than
<	less than
≤	less than or equal to
μg/g	microgram(s) per gram (parts per million)
μg/L	microgram(s) per liter
%	percent
±	plus or minus
Amec Foster Wheeler	Amec Foster Wheeler Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.
ATL	advisory tissue level
Bight '13	Southern California Bight 2013 Regional Monitoring Program
BSAF	biota sediment accumulation factor
cm	centimeter(s)
COC	chain of custody
COPC	constituent or chemical of potential concern
CRM	certified reference materials
CVWR	Chula Vista Wildlife Reserve
DDT	dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane
dw	dry weight
EDD	electronic data deliverable
GPS	Global Positioning System
IQR	interquartile range
LCS	laboratory control sample
LCSD	laboratory control sample duplicate
LOEC	lowest observed effect concentration
MDL	method detection limit
MS	matrix spike
MSD	matrix spike duplicate
NA	not applicable to the specific sampling effort
NAS	Naval Air Station
ng/g	nanogram(s) per gram (parts per billion)
NOEC	no observed effect concentration

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (CONT.)

OEHHA	Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
PAH	polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon
PBDE	polybrominated diphenyl ether
PCB	polychlorinated biphenyl
Physis	Physis Environmental Laboratory
ppm	part(s) per million
QA	quality assurance
QAPP	Quality Assurance Project Plan
QC	quality control
RL	reporting limit
RHMP	Regional Harbor Monitoring Program
RPD	relative percent difference
SAP	Sampling Analysis Plan
SCCWRP	Southern California Coastal Water Research Project
SDRWQCB	San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board
SDSU	San Diego State University
SM	Standard Method
SOP	standard operating procedure
sp.	species
SQO	sediment quality objective
SRM	standard reference material
SWAMP	Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program
SWHB	Shallow Water Habitat Bioaccumulation
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
TOC	total organic carbon
TTL	target tissue level
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
wt	weight
ww	wet weight

INTRODUCTION

Sediment-borne bioaccumulative contaminants have the potential to impair most of the designated beneficial uses for San Diego Bay. However, the ability to assess bioaccumulation-related impacts within the Bay is constrained by limited data availability and uncertainty in the approach to use for assessment and cleanup projects. The data limitations include the lack of adequate numbers of matched sediment and tissue contamination data for important receptors (e.g., sport fish and wildlife) and other components of the food web. Such data are needed to develop the understanding of bioaccumulation relationships for interpretation of site specific data and to support development of site assessment tools to evaluate conditions with respect to sediment quality objectives (SQOs) for protection of human health and wildlife.

In 2012, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (SDRWQCB), the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project (SCCWRP), and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office (CFWO) developed an integrated plan for studies to help improve understanding of contaminant transfer through San Diego Bay food webs and determine the risk to wildlife and humans from consuming contaminated fish in the bay. Funding to conduct these studies was received from the Water Board in May 2014 (Agreement 13-075-190) and January 2015 (Agreement 14-032-190). The overall goal of this project was to conduct integrated food web studies within three regions of San Diego Bay. Coordination with the 2013 Bight Regional Monitoring Survey, Regional Harbor Monitoring Program, and other studies were used to obtain bioaccumulation data for key food web components, which was supplemented by additional sampling and analyses under this project. Analyses of the data will result in an updated evaluation of sediment contamination risks for the bay to wildlife and humans, as well as provide an improved understanding of the pathways of contaminant bioaccumulation through the food web and their relationship to sediment contamination.

This report provides a summary of results for three major components of the study. The first results section describes contaminant concentrations and bioaccumulation factors among key elements of the food web in San Diego Bay (Figure 1). Two major contaminant exposure pathways were evaluated: bioaccumulation related to feeding on sediment-dwelling organisms (benthic pathway) and bioaccumulation related to uptake of contaminants in water column-dwelling organisms (pelagic pathway). The second results section provides a detailed evaluation of contamination in seabird eggs and diets, and their associated risk. Five species of waterbirds (e.g., seabirds and waterfowl that are ecologically dependent on wetlands) were examined: California least tern, Caspian tern, double-crested cormorant, surf scoter and western gull. The final results section presents an evaluation of the potential human health risk from consuming sport fish from San Diego Bay. Tissue contamination data for several popular sport fish, including spotted sand bass, California halibut, and pacific chub mackerel, were compared to consumption advisory levels developed by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA).




Figure 1. Conceptual food web for San Diego Bay.

METHODS

SAMPLE COLLECTION AND PROCESSING

Food web components

Sediment and tissue samples were obtained from three coordinated studies conducted in 2013 and 2014. Sampling was conducted in 2013 as part of the Southern California Bight Regional Monitoring Program (Bight '13) in coordination with the Regional Harbor Monitoring Program (RHMP). The 2013 sampling was based on a stratified random design and included ports, estuaries, marinas, and other bay areas in depths of 3 meters or greater (Figures 2a through 2c and 3). The Bight '13 survey also included the collection of seabird eggs from five locations in the Bay (Figure 3), as well as from eleven additional sites ranging from the Channel Islands to Tijuana Estuary. A detailed risk evaluation of the seabird egg contamination data is presented in

this report for the samples from San Diego Bay. Evaluation of egg contamination trends and risk for the entire Bight '13 data set was conducted in a separate effort and is included in a separate report (Clatterbuck et al. 2016).

Sampling in 2014 was conducted as part of a shallow water habitat survey (SWHB) designed to complement the 2013 sample collections. The SWHB samples were collected from water depths of 3 m or less in order to provide information on contamination and bioaccumulation patterns in areas frequently used as bird foraging areas and fish nursery grounds. Station locations for the SWHB survey were also based on a randomized design, with the stations allocated to three strata that represented the north, central, and south regions of the Bay (Figures 2a, 2b and 2c).

Ninety sediment stations were sampled during the surveys; with 60 stations sampled as part of Bight '13/RHMP and 30 stations sampled for the SWHB survey (Tables 1 and 2). Thirty-five of the Bight '13/RHMP sediment samples were collected from stations selected using a stratified random design. The remaining 25 Bight '13/RHMP stations were targeted, with the specific location selected to represent specific areas of interest, such as Sweetwater Channel, marinas, Ports, industrial sites, and Naval facilities (Figure 2). All of the SWHB stations were located using a stratified random design. A subset consisting of all 65 randomly located sediment stations was used in this study to represent sediment contamination in the Bay.

The location of tissue sampling stations was selected in order to provide at least three stations in each of the three Bay regions. In most cases, tissue samples were collected from a subset of the sediment collection locations. Sediment samples were collected using a Van Veen grab. Surface sediment from the upper 5 cm was removed from the grab and allocated to individual jars for chemical analysis. Multiple additional grabs were collected from some locations to obtain samples of benthic infauna for chemical analysis; the contents of these grabs were screened onboard the boat and sorted into separate jars by major taxon (polychaetes, mollusks, crustaceans). Fish trawls and/or seines were used at some stations to collect small and medium-sized fish for chemical analysis. The whole fish samples were wrapped in clean aluminum foil, placed in food-grade polyethylene bags, and stored on ice. All sample containers were labeled with project name, sample identification number, site location, date and time, and frozen within 24 hours of collection.

A total of 209 tissue samples, representing major components of benthic and pelagic food webs in San Diego Bay were collected and analyzed for contaminants (Figure 1, Table 3). Eggs from four seabird species were analyzed, consisting of 44 samples. California least tern eggs were collected from four sites, while eggs from western gulls, Caspian terns, and double-crested cormorants were obtained from single locations. Tissues from five species of sport fish, representing 23 composite or individual fish samples, were analyzed to assess potential human health risk. A total of 87 forage fish tissue samples, representing 13 species, were analyzed. Fish species included small surface feeders (e.g., anchovy, topsmelt) and medium-sized fish having a diet that included benthic organisms (e.g., black perch, round stingray, barred sand bass, spotted sand bass, and California halibut). Samples of benthic invertebrates and plankton from each of the three Bay regions were also collected in 2013 and 2014.




Figure 2a. North Bay sediment sample locations for Bight '13 regional survey and Regional Harbor Monitoring Program (Bight '13) and shallow water habitat survey (SWHB).



Figure 2b. Central Bay sediment sample locations for Bight '13 regional survey and Regional Harbor Monitoring Program (Bight '13) and shallow water habitat survey (SWHB).



Figure 2c. South Bay sediment sample locations for Bight '13 regional survey and Regional Harbor Monitoring Program (Bight '13) and shallow water habitat survey (SWHB).




Figure 3. Tissue sample locations for Bight '13 regional survey and Regional Harbor Monitoring Program (Bight '13) and shallow water habitat survey (SWHB).

Table 1. Bight '13 and Regional Harbor Monitoring Program stations and sample types used for analysis of bioaccumulation relationships. Sample types: S = sediment, F = fish, I = benthic invertebrate, P = plankton, B = seabird egg, T = targeted station (non random). Samples located in Sweetwater Marsh were classified as San Diego Bay South for spatial comparisons.

Study	Location	Station	Latitude	Longitude	Type
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	B13-8085	32.691687	-117.238244	S
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	B13-8087	32.691721	-117.153217	S
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	B13-8090	32.692885	-117.147582	TS
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	B13-8093	32.695601	-117.162557	S
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	B13-8095	32.696061	-117.153454	TS
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	B13-8096	32.698521	-117.158791	TS
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	B13-8098	32.699765	-117.160977	TS
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	B13-8099	32.702034	-117.160821	TS
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	B13-8100	32.7024	-117.16178	S
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	NAS North Isl	32.7114626	-117.211759	B
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	B13-8102	32.711543	-117.232552	S
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	B13-8105	32.712275	-117.213967	S
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	B13-8106	32.712329	-117.232133	S
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	B13-8108	32.714498	-117.230108	TS
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	B13-8109	32.714963	-117.182907	SFI
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	SDN3	32.71505	-117.22385	FP
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	B13-8111	32.716092	-117.173953	S
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	B13-8112	32.71619	-117.176237	S
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	B13-8113	32.716887	-117.225212	S
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	B13-8116	32.718402	-117.2304	S
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	B13-8117	32.718569	-117.226112	S
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	B13-8118	32.719885	-117.178736	SFI
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	B13-8121	32.724357	-117.224815	TS
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	B13-8122	32.724148	-117.182983	SFI
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	B13-8123	32.725018	-117.183684	S
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	SDN1	32.72585	-117.1807	F
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	B13-8124	32.726301	-117.186644	S
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	B13-8127	32.726737	-117.202524	S
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	B13-8128	32.727123	-117.191922	S
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	B13-8500	32.727047	-117.17733	TS
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	SDN2	32.7272833	-117.1879334	F
Bight13	San Diego Bay North	Lindbergh Field	32.7291875	-117.1803969	B
Bight13	San Diego Bay Central	B13-8045	32.65155	-117.122464	S
Bight13	San Diego Bay Central	B13-8049	32.656156	-117.122617	TS
Bight13	San Diego Bay Central	B13-8050	32.657727	-117.123113	TS
Bight13	San Diego Bay Central	B13-8052	32.65828	-117.14434	SFI
Bight13	San Diego Bay Central	B13-8053	32.658476	-117.119532	TS
Bight13	San Diego Bay Central	SDC2	32.65895	-117.1527333	F
Bight13	San Diego Bay Central	B13-8056	32.660613	-117.12339	S
Bight13	San Diego Bay Central	B13-8058	32.661471	-117.144097	S
Bight13	San Diego Bay Central	SDC3	32.6636667	-117.1562667	F

Study	Location	Station	Latitude	Longitude	Type
Bight13	San Diego Bay Central	B13-8060	32.665184	-117.149804	SFI
Bight13	San Diego Bay Central	SDC1	32.6693	-117.1569668	FP
Bight13	San Diego Bay Central	B13-8064	32.670959	-117.123959	TS
Bight13	San Diego Bay Central	B13-8065	32.671353	-117.119134	S
Bight13	San Diego Bay Central	B13-8066	32.671711	-117.125316	TS
Bight13	San Diego Bay Central	B13-8068	32.675472	-117.143841	S
Bight13	San Diego Bay Central	B13-8069	32.676137	-117.127961	TS
Bight13	San Diego Bay Central	B13-8073	32.680331	-117.174759	S
Bight13	San Diego Bay Central	B13-8074	32.685488	-117.136521	TS
Bight13	San Diego Bay Central	B13-8075	32.68561	-117.133926	TS
Bight13	San Diego Bay Central	B13-8076	32.686389	-117.133315	TS
Bight13	San Diego Bay Central	B13-8077	32.686515	-117.134088	TS
Bight13	San Diego Bay Central	B13-8078	32.686723	-117.148594	SFI
Bight13	San Diego Bay South	Salt Works	32.59924	-117.102809	B
Bight13	San Diego Bay South	SDS2	32.60755	-117.1305334	F
Bight13	San Diego Bay South	Chula Vista Wildlife Reserve	32.61403	-117.11086	B
Bight13	San Diego Bay South	B13-8013	32.623601	-117.13346	S
Bight13	San Diego Bay South	B13-8014	32.626539	-117.134678	S
Bight13	San Diego Bay South	B13-8017	32.631569	-117.13084	SFI
Bight13	San Diego Bay South	SDS3	32.63298	-117.13888	F
Bight13	San Diego Bay South	B13-8018	32.63417	-117.10733	S
Bight13	San Diego Bay South	B13-8020	32.641792	-117.131413	SFI
Bight13	San Diego Bay South	D-Street fill	32.64619	-117.11455	B
Bight13	San Diego Bay South	SDS1	32.6462667	-117.1165168	FP
Bight13	San Diego Bay South	B13-8028	32.646603	-117.119345	TS
Bight13	San Diego Bay South	B13-8029	32.646936	-117.118238	SFI
Bight13	Sweetwater Marsh	B13-8030	32.647272	-117.116671	TS
Bight13	Sweetwater Marsh	B13-8031	32.647579	-117.121483	TS
Bight13	Sweetwater Marsh	B13-8033	32.647521	-117.119449	TS
Bight13	Sweetwater Marsh	B13-8036	32.647856	-117.116137	TS
Bight13	Sweetwater Marsh	B13-8038	32.648344	-117.114007	TS
Bight13	Sweetwater Marsh	B13-8040	32.649219	-117.110064	TS
Bight13	Sweetwater Marsh	B13-8043	32.65037	-117.105093	S

Seabird eggs

Eggs were collected during the 2013 nesting season, as part of the Bight 2013 regional monitoring program. Eggs were collected during routine surveys by colony monitors with appropriate permits. All of the eggs collected had failed-to-hatch, which was evident by nest abandonment, crushing, or not having hatched after sufficient time for incubation. Eggs were placed in cartons and transported to the CFWO lab for processing using standard protocols adopted for studies on the impacts of PCBs in the Hudson River (Hudson River Natural Resources Trustees 2002).

At CFWO, eggs were gently cleaned with distilled water, weighed, and breadth and width were measured to the nearest 0.1 mm using a dial caliper. For those eggs that were not cracked, the volume was measured as the weight of water displaced by the egg. For those that were cracked, volume was estimated using the generic approach by Hoyt (1979) combined with species-specific data collected for this study. A scalpel, pre-rinsed with dilute nitric acid followed by distilled water, reagent grade acetone and reagent grade hexane was used to cut the shell around the equator. Contents were viewed for evidence of embryo development and malpositioning (if a chick was present) before transfer to a chemically pre-cleaned I-Chem jar.

If an embryo was present, it was further evaluated for evidence of conspicuous malformations (e.g., missing limbs, malformed beaks). To minimize potential loss of sample and cross-contamination that could result from physical manipulation, embryos were not evaluated for subtle malformations that required measurements. Once observations were recorded, egg contents were placed in a non self-defrosting freezer for storage until they were transferred to the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project to be logged in with other Bight '13 samples, and later submitted for chemical analysis to a laboratory designated by SCCWRP. Eggs of the Caspian tern, western gull and double-crested cormorant were large enough for each egg to be an individual sample (i.e., 1 egg / sample). Because of their small size, least tern eggs were composited (2 or more eggs/sample) to produce enough material for chemical analysis. A total of 44 samples were prepared for chemical analyses (Table 3).

Eggshells were placed in cartons to dry at room temperature for a minimum of 30 days. Once dry, the thickness of each eggshell (shell + shell membrane) was measured at four points around the girth with a Starrett electronic digital micrometer fitted with a ball attachment, and with a Starrett Model 1010M dial micrometer, both accurate to 0.01 mm, and estimatable to 0.001 mm. Two micrometers were used because dial micrometer performance is affected by shell curvature (a problem with small eggs; readings may be high), while the ball of the digital micrometer may slightly dent membranes (readings may be low). The Starrett model M1010 micrometer is commonly used, so that results obtained with this micrometer were used preferentially for identifying trends in shell thickness and particularly for comparisons with results from other studies. Dried shells were then weighed, and placed in WhirlPac bags for storage at CFWO. Two different measures of shell thickness were recorded for each egg: one was thickness, as measured (in mm) with micrometers, the other was the Ratcliffe's Index (RI), as described by Burnham et al. (1984). The RI is not a direct measure of thickness, but it is estimate of eggshell density (which is affected by thickness) that is free of potential shortcomings of micrometer readings. The RI combined with direct measurements offer a weight of evidence approach to assessing eggshell thinning. The RI for each egg was computed as:

$$RI = \text{dry weight of the shell (mg)} / [\text{shell length (mm)} \times \text{shell breadth (mm)}].$$

Data on egg status and measurements were provided to SCCWRP, and subsequently entered into the Bight '13 database. A total of 76 individual eggs were evaluated for condition, morphometrics, and two measures of eggshell thickness.

Table 2. Shallow water habitat survey stations and sample types used for analysis of bioaccumulation relationships. Sample types: S = sediment, F = fish, I = benthic invertebrate, P = plankton.

Study	Location	Station	Latitude	Longitude	Type
SWHB	San Diego Bay North	SWHB-26	32.68911	-117.16324	SFIP
SWHB	San Diego Bay North	SWHB-27	32.72411	-117.18791	SFIP
SWHB	San Diego Bay North	SWHB-28	32.70289	-117.18027	S
SWHB	San Diego Bay North	SWHB-30	32.68464	-117.2243	SFIP
SWHB	San Diego Bay North	SWHB-53	32.72818	-117.20972	S
SWHB	San Diego Bay Central	SWHB-01	32.6724	-117.15436	SFIP
SWHB	San Diego Bay Central	SWHB-02	32.67494	-117.15588	S
SWHB	San Diego Bay Central	SWHB-06	32.68185	-117.15135	SFIP
SWHB	San Diego Bay Central	SWHB-07	32.64702	-117.14289	S
SWHB	San Diego Bay Central	SWHB-08	32.65375	-117.14886	S
SWHB	San Diego Bay Central	SWHB-09	32.68077	-117.15484	S
SWHB	San Diego Bay Central	SWHB-10	32.68487	-117.16341	S
SWHB	San Diego Bay Central	SWHB-33	32.66704	-117.15545	S
SWHB	San Diego Bay Central	SWHB-36	32.67863	-117.16811	S
SWHB	San Diego Bay Central	SWHB-40	32.65508	-117.14755	SFIP
SWHB	San Diego Bay South	SWHB-11	32.60259	-117.11629	S
SWHB	San Diego Bay South	SWHB-12	32.61583	-117.10535	S
SWHB	San Diego Bay South	SWHB-13	32.63547	-117.13809	S
SWHB	San Diego Bay South	SWHB-14	32.61416	-117.12204	S
SWHB	San Diego Bay South	SWHB-15	32.60923	-117.10791	SFIP
SWHB	San Diego Bay South	SWHB-16	32.6175	-117.11693	S
SWHB	San Diego Bay South	SWHB-18	32.60573	-117.12089	S
SWHB	San Diego Bay South	SWHB-19	32.60828	-117.11898	S
SWHB	San Diego Bay South	SWHB-20	32.62629	-117.11212	S
SWHB	San Diego Bay South	SWHB-21	32.63798	-117.12307	SFIP
SWHB	San Diego Bay South	SWHB-22	32.6231	-117.12018	SFIP
SWHB	San Diego Bay South	SWHB-23	32.61	-117.11491	S
SWHB	San Diego Bay South	SWHB-24	32.63681	-117.11744	S
SWHB	San Diego Bay South	SWHB-25	32.63007	-117.12437	S
SWHB	San Diego Bay South	SWHB-41	32.62669	-117.12809	S

Table 3. Number of tissue and sediment samples analyzed for contamination.

Sample Group	Common Name	Count
Seabird (eggs)	California least tern	18
Seabird (eggs)	Caspian tern	10
Seabird (eggs)	Double-crested cormorant	8
Seabird (eggs)	Western gull	8
	Seabird Egg Total	44
Sport fish	California halibut	8
Sport fish	Pacific chub mackerel	3
Sport fish	Round stingray	2
Sport fish	Spotted sand bass	9
Sport fish	Topsmelt	1
	Sport Fish Total	23
Forage fish	Arrow goby	1
Forage fish	Barred sand bass	9
Forage fish	Black perch	2
Forage fish	California halibut	20
Forage fish	California killifish	2
Forage fish	Deepbody anchovy	11
Forage fish	Goby sp.	3
Forage fish	Northern anchovy	2
Forage fish	Round stingray	1
Forage fish	Shiner perch	6
Forage fish	Slough anchovy	10
Forage fish	Spotted sand bass	11
Forage fish	Topsmelt	9
	Forage Fish Total	87
Crustacea	Crustacea	13
Mollusks	Mollusks	11
Polychaetes	Polychaetes	18
	Benthic Infauna Total	42
Plankton	Plankton	13
	Tissue Grand Total	209
Sediment	Sediment	90

Sport fish

Sport fish were collected from several locations San Diego Bay in 2014 and 2015 (Figure 4). Fish were collected by rig fishing during two types of sampling events. Samples obtained in 2014 were collected by SCCWRP from a small boat that targeted specific regions of the Bay. Sport fish were collected in 2015 from a fishing derby that involved multiple volunteers from a variety of locations in the north, central, and south regions of the Bay, including shore, piers, and small vessels. Station positions were logged from either the vessel's GPS system or a hand-held GPS instrument and recorded in a field log. The whole fish samples were wrapped in clean aluminum foil, placed in food-grade polyethylene bags, stored on ice, and frozen within 24 hours of collection. The sample bags were labeled with project name, sample identification number, site location, and date and time.

A total of 137 sport fish were collected during this study. Species collected included barred sand bass, bonefish, California halibut, Pacific chub mackerel, round stingray, sargo, shortfin corvina, spotted sand bass, yellowfin croaker, and topsmelt. A subset of species and samples were selected for chemical analysis (n=23). This subset was selected to include fish frequently consumed by the local population, and included California halibut, Pacific chub mackerel, round stingray, topsmelt, and spotted sand bass (Table 4). Sample selection also considered location, so that contaminant concentrations could be compared among the North, Central, and South regions of the Bay.

Samples of California halibut were analyzed individually. All other species were analyzed as composites composed of approximately 5 fish of the same species. Selection of individuals for each composite was usually based on sampling location; fish were grouped from locations that were located near each other in order to provide better representation of spatial variation in contamination. Composites of Pacific chub mackerel and topsmelt were composed of the whole fish, without head, tail, or guts. All other species composites were composed of fillet without skin. Additional information on the composition of each composite is provided in Appendix H.




Figure 4. Sport fish collection locations.

Table 4. Location of sport fish samples collected during 2014 SCCWRP rig fishing or 2015 fish derby and used for chemical analysis. Fish derby was conducted on 6/6/2015.

Location	Mode	Station	Date	Latitude	Longitude	Species ¹
North Bay	Boat	NB-5	9/25/2014	32.70088	-117.16477	SSB
North Bay	Boat	CB-22	10/14/2014	32.688537	-117.161099	SSB
North Bay	Pier	Coronado Tidelands Park	6/6/2015	32.699481	-117.168635	SSB
North Bay	Pier	Embarcadero South	6/6/2015	32.703114	-117.164845	PCM, RR, SSB
North Bay	Boat	NB-20	12/10/2014	32.709799	-117.225872	SSB
North Bay	Pier	Shelter Island	6/6/2015	32.711349	-117.227948	CH, PCM, RR
Central Bay	Boat	CB-1	10/14/2014	32.66007	-117.12877	CH
Central Bay	Boat	CB-2	12/10/2014	32.68128	-117.14057	CH
Central Bay	Boat	CB-20	12/10/2014	32.68399	-117.14548	SSB
Central Bay	Boat	CB-7	12/10/2014	32.68167	-117.14009	SSB
Central Bay	Boat	CB-24	6/6/2015	32.6703	-117.138716	CH
Central Bay	Boat	CB-30	6/6/2015	32.6745	-117.139566	SSB
Central Bay	Boat	CB-5	7/4/2015	32.68383	-117.14635	CH
Central Bay	Boat	CB-25	7/5/2015	32.6797	-117.14145	CH
South Bay	Boat	SB-1	12/10/2014	32.60269	-117.11681	CH
South Bay	Pier	Pepper Park	6/6/2015	32.649231	-117.112357	SSB, TS
South Bay	Pier	SB-5	6/6/2015	32.649231	-117.112357	PCM
South Bay	Boat	SU-1	10/14/2014	32.60269	-117.11681	SSB

¹Species codes: CH = California halibut; SSB = spotted sand bass; PCM = pacific chub mackerel; RR = round stingray; TS = topsmelt.

CHEMICAL ANALYSIS

Chemical analyses of the samples were conducted primarily by Physis and the City of San Diego. Sediment samples were analyzed for total solids, total organic carbon (TOC), grain size, aluminum, antimony, arsenic, barium, beryllium, cadmium, chromium, copper, iron, lead, mercury, nickel, selenium, silver, zinc, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), chlorinated pesticides, pyrethroid pesticides, polychlorinated biphenyl congeners (PCBs), and polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDEs).

Tissue samples were analyzed for total solids, lipids, mercury, selenium, PCBs, chlorinated pesticides, and PBDEs (Table 5). Samples of seabird eggs were also analyzed for perfluorinated compounds (PFCs), a compound of emerging concern. The PFC analyses were donated as part of a collaborative special study and were conducted only on seabird eggs.

Table 5. Analytes and laboratory analytical methods for tissue samples.

Analyte	Analysis Method	Reporting Limit ¹	Units
Tissue			
Percent Solids	SM 2540B ⁶	--	%
Lipid	Gravimetric	--	%
Mercury	245.7 ²	20	ng/g ww
Chlorinated Pesticides ³	8270C/8270D ²	0.5	ng/g ww
Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCB) Congeners ⁴	8270C/8270D PCB ²	0.5	ng/g ww
Polybrominated Diphenyl Ethers (PBDEs) ⁵	8270C/8270D NCI	0.2-10	ng/g ww
Sediment			
Total Solids	160.3/SM2540 ⁶	0.1	%
Total Organic Carbon (TOC)	9060	0.01	%
Mercury	7474 ²	20	ng/g dw
Metals	6020/6010B ²	100	ng/g dw
Chlorinated Pesticides ³	8270/8270D ²	0.5	ng/g dw
Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCB) Congeners ⁴	8270C/8270DPCB ²	0.2-10	ng/g dw
Polybrominated Diphenyl Ethers (PBDEs) ⁵	8270D NCI	0.1	ng/g dw

¹ Reporting limits were provided by Physis Environmental Laboratories.

² USEPA 1986-1996. SW-846. Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste, Physical/Chemical Methods, 3rd Edition.

³ Includes cis-chlordane, trans-chlordane, o,p'-DDT, p,p'-DDT, o,p'-DDD, p,p'-DDD, o,p'-DDE, p,p'-DDE, p,p'-DDMU, aldrin, BHC-alpha, BHC-beta, BHC-gamma, cis-nonachlor, trans-nonachlor, oxychlordane, DCPA (Dacthal), dicofol, dieldrin, toxaphene, endosulfan sulfate, endosulfan-I, endosulfan-II, endrin, endrin aldehyde, endrin ketone, heptachlor, heptachlor epoxide, methoxychlor, mirex, and perthane.

⁴ Includes congeners: PCB-3, 5, 8, 15, 18, 27-29, 31, 33, 37, 44, 49, 52, 56, 60, 66, 70, 74, 77, 81, 87, 95, 97, 99, 101, 105, 110, 114, 118, 119, 123, 126, 128, 137, 138, 141, 149, 151, 153, 156-158, 167-170, 174, 177, 180, 183, 187, 189, 194,195, 200, 201, 203, 206, and 209.

⁵ Includes congeners: BDE-17, 28, 47, 49, 66, 85, 99, 100, 138, 153, 154, 183, and 209.

⁶ Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater, 2nd Edition, Rice et al., 2013

DATA ANALYSIS

Contamination data were summarized for both the entire San Diego Bay and by region. Three Bay regions were evaluated: North, Central, and South. Bay region boundaries are shown in Figures 2a, 2b and 2c.

Egg fresh-weight correction

Results of chemical analyses are presented as fresh weight (fw)-based concentrations, which entail adjustments of analytical results for moisture loss that can occur with time between when the egg was laid and when it was collected. To obtain fw-based values, wet weight-based contaminant levels reported by the laboratory were adjusted according to methods by Stickel et al. (1973), using volume and weight measurements obtained for each egg. The extent of moisture loss from individual eggs was variable, such that adjustment factors ranged from 0.27 to 1.0. Mean adjustment factors were calculated for those samples that were composites of multiple eggs (i.e., least terns).

Wet weight (ww)-based concentrations reported by the laboratory were converted to fresh weight-based values as follows:

fw concentration = ww concentration x adjustment factor

Contaminant summarization

Results of tissue analyses are reported as parts per billion (ppb), either as ng/g ww (fish and invertebrates) or ng/g fw (eggs). Sediment chemistry results are reported on a dry weight basis, as ng/g dw. Results for other trace metals in sediment are not included in this summary, due to lack of matching data in tissue samples and limited potential to biomagnify through the food web.

Sums of organic contaminant classes (e.g., chlordanes, PCBs, DDTs, PBDEs, and PFCs) were calculated as the sum of all detected analytes within the class. In cases where all class components were nondetect for a sample, the sum value was represented by the highest detection limit of any of the class components. The sums of the 41 Bight '13 PCB congeners are approximately 17% lower than total PCB concentrations computed in other studies as sums of 90 or more congeners, sums of homologs, or by using an Aroclor standard approach. The sum PCB concentrations were adjusted upward by approximately 17% in the chapter on Wildlife Risk to enable comparisons with results of other studies and screening thresholds for adverse effects.

Comparisons of bioaccumulation among species or bay regions were based on the median in order to minimize the influence of extreme individual values. Comparisons between groups were only conducted if there were at least two samples of the same species in the group. Individual values were not included in summary comparisons as it could not be determined whether such values were reliable indicators of group trends or spatial patterns. Evaluations of potential risk to wildlife or humans were based on average tissue contaminant concentrations, rather than the median. Use of the average for these evaluations is consistent with standard practice in risk assessment and provides a more representative measure of exposure to the organism than does the median.

Quality control

Each batch of chemical analyses included several types of quality control (QC) samples to document laboratory method performance. The QC procedures followed guidelines used in the Bight'13 regional monitoring program and were consistent with Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) recommendations. The QC elements included:

- **Calibration Verification.** A new response factor or calibration curve was established for each instrumental batch. A calibration verification standard was analyzed every 12 hours to check the accuracy of the calibration. The control limit for this element was $\pm 20\%$ of the true value.
- **Method Blanks.** A method blank was run with each sample preparation batch (or per every 20 samples) and processed identical to the field samples. The control limit for blanks was $<$ Reporting Limit for each analyte.
- **Sample Duplicates.** Analysis of sample duplicates was conducted at a frequency of 5% of the total sample count. The control limit for this element was a relative percent difference (RPD) of no more than 35%.
- **Matrix Spikes and Matrix Spike Duplicates.** Matrix spike and matrix spike duplicates (MS/MSD) were analyzed at a frequency of one per batch or for every 20 samples (whichever is more frequent). The control limit for MS was 50-150% recovery and the control limit for MSD was $RPD \leq 25\%$.
- **Certified Reference Materials or Laboratory Control Samples.** Method accuracy was evaluated through the analysis of either certified reference materials (CRM) or laboratory control samples (LCS) at a frequency of one per batch or per every 20 samples. The CRM control limit was 70-130% recovery and 50-150% for LCS.
- **Standards and Standard Recovery.** Quantification standards consisted of either isotope-labeled or structurally similar analogues to the target analytes and were included with every sample analyzed. The control limit for standard recovery was 50-150%.

All analytical data were reviewed for QC performance by the analytical laboratory and SCCWRP. QC sample results not meeting the control limits were flagged and investigated to determine the need for corrective action.

BIOACCUMULATION AMONG FOOD WEB COMPONENTS

DATA ANALYSIS

Biota sediment accumulation factor

A biota sediment accumulation factor (BSAF) was calculated for each tissue sample. The BSAF represents the degree of contaminant bioaccumulation in the sample, relative to the sediment. The BSAF was calculated as:

$$\text{BSAF} = C_{\text{Tis}}/C_{\text{Sed}}$$

Where:

C_{Tis} = tissue contaminant concentration (ng/g ww)

C_{Sed} = sediment contaminant concentration (ng/g dw)

The sediment and tissue concentrations used for BSAF calculations were matched by station for the invertebrates and the fish. Sediment concentrations used in the BSAF calculations for seabird eggs were the average of all sediment samples from the appropriate Bay region. The median of all individual values was used to represent the BSAF for each taxonomic group and region.

Normalized biota sediment accumulation factor

Normalized BSAFs were calculated to account for the effect of tissue lipid and sediment organic content on bioaccumulation in benthic infauna and fish.

The normalized BSAF was calculated as:

$$\text{Normalized BSAF} = C_{\text{TisLipid}}/C_{\text{SedOC}}$$

Where:

C_{TisLipid} = tissue contaminant concentration (ug/kg lipid)

C_{SedOC} = sediment contaminant concentration (ug/kg organic carbon)

The sediment contaminant and total organic carbon concentrations used for fish and infauna BSAF calculations were based on measurements of sediment at the collection station corresponding to each tissue sample.

BAY-WIDE TISSUE AND SEDIMENT CONTAMINATION

General trends in bioaccumulation patterns are illustrated in the following sections using box plots, which show the median, interquartile range (25th to 75th percentile), and individual data points.

Tissue chemistry results for the entire San Diego Bay showed that biomagnification among food web components was evident for all major contaminant types evaluated (Figure 5, Table 6).

Relative to the other sample types, seabird eggs (all species combined) had the highest median concentration of PCBs, DDTs, PBDEs, chlordanes, and mercury. Similar patterns were evident for most contaminant types, with the lowest concentrations occurring in the lowest trophic levels of plankton and benthic infauna (crustaceans, mollusks, polychaetes). Intermediate contaminant levels were present in fish (all species combined). PBDEs did not follow this pattern, however, with fish having similar or lower median concentrations as benthic infauna and plankton.

The greatest bioaccumulation relative to sediment was observed for PCBs and DDTs, where all food web components had median concentrations above bay-wide sediment median concentrations. Bioaccumulation of chlordanes by benthic infauna and plankton was low and showed little apparent relationship to sediment, likely due to the lack of detectable concentrations in most of the sediment samples. Chlordane was not detected in most of the plankton and benthic invertebrate samples.

Median tissue mercury concentrations were below the sediment median for all trophic levels. The influence of local sediment mercury contamination on tissue levels cannot be determined from this study because mercury speciation in sediment was not determined. Most sediment mercury is present in the inorganic form, while methylated forms of mercury are the bioavailable form responsible for most of the bioaccumulation. BSAF values (either normalized or non-normalized) were not calculated for mercury due to this variation in data type. Contaminant levels in biota are wet weight-based. If the biota data were normalized for moisture, then concentrations would be four to five times higher.




Figure 5. Summary of tissue contamination data for the entire San Diego Bay. The median is represented by the horizontal line, the box shows the interquartile range (IQR), and the whiskers flag potential outliers and extend to the furthest data point that is $1.5 \times \text{IQR}$ from the box. Circles show individual data values. Dashed red line indicates median contaminant concentration in sediment (dry weight basis).

Table 6. Bay-wide contaminant concentration summary by taxonomic group.

Group	Analyte	Min	Mean	Median	Max	StdDev	Count	Units
Seabird (eggs)	Chlordanes	0.04	5.03	3.56	24.64	4.92	44	ng/g fw
Seabird (eggs)	DDTs	43.32	686.02	301.30	3643.55	855.88	44	ng/g fw
Seabird (eggs)	PBDEs	8.77	123.33	71.97	413.87	110.99	44	ng/g fw
Seabird (eggs)	PCBs ¹	64.30	418.54	284.17	1950.77	393.69	44	ng/g fw
Seabird (eggs)	PFCs	7.54	27.63	25.84	72.53	18.39	27	ng/g fw
Seabird (eggs)	Mercury	18.19	202.44	171.23	1019.69	180.02	43	ng/g fw
Crustacea	Chlordanes	0.05	0.29	0.05	2.66	0.72	13	ng/g ww
Crustacea	DDTs	0.05	6.07	5.97	21.48	5.48	13	ng/g ww
Crustacea	Dieldrin	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.00	7	ng/g ww
Crustacea	PBDEs	0.05	11.13	2.96	99.45	26.69	13	ng/g ww
Crustacea	PCBs	16.84	91.46	79.30	168.59	54.07	13	ng/g ww
Crustacea	Mercury	22.2	33.09	33.47	54.9	9.81	10	ng/g ww
Fish	Chlordanes	0.03	1.82	1.23	10.21	1.89	87	ng/g ww
Fish	DDTs	0.05	12.49	10.78	46.36	8.77	87	ng/g ww
Fish	Dieldrin	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.00	21	ng/g ww
Fish	PBDEs	0.05	3.17	1.79	19.53	4.20	87	ng/g ww
Fish	PCBs	25.69	211.45	197.15	570.60	112.32	87	ng/g ww
Fish	Mercury	14.09	52.17	44.18	239.2	37.28	82	ng/g ww
Mollusks	Chlordanes	0.05	0.44	0.05	2.15	0.68	11	ng/g ww
Mollusks	DDTs	0.05	6.07	3.29	33.08	9.46	11	ng/g ww
Mollusks	Dieldrin	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.00	2	ng/g ww
Mollusks	PBDEs	0.05	1.39	0.86	4.00	1.30	11	ng/g ww
Mollusks	PCBs	2.70	43.55	21.14	169.42	50.88	11	ng/g ww
Mollusks	Mercury	12.6	40.5	35.98	87.68	22.2	10	ng/g ww
Polychaetes	Chlordanes	0.05	1.03	0.05	4.61	1.38	18	ng/g ww
Polychaetes	DDTs	1.81	7.14	5.67	21.53	4.65	18	ng/g ww
Polychaetes	Dieldrin	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.00	9	ng/g ww
Polychaetes	PBDEs	1.23	6.03	3.86	21.68	5.24	18	ng/g ww
Polychaetes	PCBs	28.43	122.21	123.19	283.07	62.95	18	ng/g ww
Polychaetes	Mercury	15.65	99.1	51.41	429.46	106.12	16	ng/g ww
Group	Analyte	Min	Mean	Median	Max	StdDev	Count	Units
Plankton	Chlordanes	0.05	0.30	0.05	1.26	0.38	13	ng/g ww
Plankton	DDTs	0.05	6.15	3.59	24.95	8.19	13	ng/g ww
Plankton	PBDEs	1.77	17.54	8.96	108.27	28.58	13	ng/g ww
Plankton	PCBs	0.10	58.83	63.56	169.45	46.53	13	ng/g ww
Plankton	Mercury	5.55	25.12	17.99	72.08	20.53	9	ng/g ww

¹ Calculated total PCB concentrations used for the wildlife risk evaluation are higher due to adjustment for analysis of a limited number of congeners

BIOACCUMULATION BY BAY REGION

Sediment contaminant concentrations of trace organics varied both by contaminant type and region. Sediment PCBs were present at approximately 20-100x higher concentrations than DDTs among the random station data set (Table 7). The North region of the Bay contained a higher median concentration PCBs, while median mercury concentrations in the North and Central were approximately twice the concentration in the South. Regional trends in median sediment chlordanes, dieldrin, and DDTs could not be evaluated due to a lack of detectable concentrations at most stations. However, comparison of the average and maximum concentrations suggest that the North and South regions contained higher concentrations of sediment DDTs than the Central.

Higher sediment contaminant concentrations were frequently present among the targeted sediment samples, which were not randomly selected. For example, PCB average concentrations were approximately 5-7 fold greater for the targeted stations compared to the random stations from the same region (Table 7). Average mercury concentrations generally varied a factor of 2 or less between the two station types. DDT average concentrations for targeted stations were 40-100 fold higher in the North and Central Bay, but less than two-fold higher in the South. The targeted station group usually contained higher maximum concentrations values than the random group.

The location of the targeted stations appeared to account for most of the concentration differences. The targeted stations in the North and Central regions were selected to be almost exclusively located in areas expected to have high contamination relative to other parts of the Bay, such as Naval, industrial, or port facilities (Tables 2a and 2b). The randomly selected stations were stratified based on water depth or general land use type, and are more representative of overall conditions in each Bay region. The difference among sample types is most pronounced in the South, where all of the targeted stations were located in Sweetwater Channel while the random stations were distributed throughout the shallow and developed portions of the region, and also included two stations in the channel (Figure 2c).

Chemistry data from only the randomly selected stations were used for comparisons to describe overall trends in tissue contaminant concentrations throughout the bay, as these stations were more representative of the bay as a result of the randomized selection process. The targeted station group did not include the specific locations where the biota samples were collected. Inclusion of the targeted station stations in the bioaccumulation analyses would likely bias comparisons to biota and obscure regional trends in sediment contamination due to their nonrepresentative nature. Only the sediment data corresponding to the station used for biota collection were used for calculations of bioaccumulation factors (e.g., BSAF).

Plankton and benthic infauna

Tissue contaminant concentrations of trace organics and mercury in plankton and benthic infauna were similar (Figures 6 and 7). In addition, there was no consistent trend in relative concentration among the three types of infauna. For PCBs, mollusks had lower median contaminant concentrations than crustaceans or polychaetes. However, total DDTs concentrations were similar among infauna groups (Figure 6). Tissue contamination in infauna did not appear to follow trends in sediment concentration for PCBs and DDTs. While

crustaceans had higher tissue PCBs concentrations in the North (as did sediment), mollusks and polychaetes had higher PCBs in the Central (where DDTs were lowest).

Mercury concentrations in plankton and infauna were generally quite similar, except for elevated levels in polychaetes from the Central Bay (Figure 7). Little correspondence between sediment and tissue mercury concentrations was evident. Similar tissue mercury concentrations were observed in plankton and invertebrates among regions, even though sediment mercury concentration was 2-4 fold higher in the North. Relatively high mercury concentrations were present in Central and South polychaetes, relative to other infauna groups in the region. It is possible that the elevated concentrations are due to the presence of sediment in the polychaete intestine or the tube. Most of the polychaetes in the samples were likely to be sediment deposit feeders that live within a tube constructed partly of sediment.

Table 7. Sediment chemical concentration summary for both random and targeted stations collected in three regions of San Diego Bay.

Analyte Name	Min	Mean	Median	Max	StdDev	Count	Units
Randomly Selected Stations							
San Diego North							
Chlordanes	0.05	0.44	0.05	6.44	1.34	24	ng/g dw
DDTs	0.05	0.16	0.05	2.06	0.41	24	ng/g dw
Dieldrin ¹	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0	5	ng/g dw
Mercury	4.10	465.39	240	1930	478.81	24	ng/g dw
PCBs	0.10	21.03	12.81	90.00	23.69	24	ng/g dw
San Diego Central							
Chlordanes	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.36	0.07	19	ng/g dw
DDTs	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.39	0.08	19	ng/g dw
Dieldrin ¹	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0	10	ng/g dw
Mercury	30.4	259.73	290.00	640	151.07	10	ng/g dw
PCBs	0.10	7.09	5.67	25.10	7.34	19	ng/g dw
San Diego South							
Chlordanes	0.05	0.09	0.05	0.88	0.18	22	ng/g dw
DDTs	0.05	0.29	0.05	2.3	0.60	22	ng/g dw
Dieldrin ¹	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0	15	ng/g dw
Mercury	30.0	132.46	104.75	630	121.60	22	ng/g dw
PCBs	0.95	4.86	4.23	13.39	3.44	22	ng/g dw
Targeted Stations							
San Diego North							
Chlordanes	0.05	4.51	0.05	34.1	11.96	8	ng/g dw
DDTs	0.05	6.92	0.05	46.3	16.20	8	ng/g dw
Dieldrin ²	-	-	-	-	-	-	ng/g dw
Mercury	128	820.5	439	3551	1138.44	8	ng/g dw
PCBs	0.4	157.69	11.60	685	255.51	8	ng/g dw
San Diego Central							
Chlordanes	0.05	2.971	0.05	13.3	4.91	10	ng/g dw
DDTs	0.05	6.7	0.05	26.1	9.50	10	ng/g dw
Dieldrin ²	-	-	-	-	-	-	ng/g dw
Mercury	85.4	519.64	605.5	688	198.82	10	ng/g dw
PCBs	1.31	31.529	29.85	63.6	22.62	10	ng/g dw
San Diego South							
Chlordanes	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.18	0.05	7	ng/g dw
DDTs	0.05	0.17	0.05	0.91	0.33	7	ng/g dw
Dieldrin ²	-	-	-	-	-	-	ng/g dw
Mercury	16	116.34	108	185	57.79	7	ng/g dw
PCBs	1.31	31.53	29.85	63.6	22.62	10	ng/g dw

¹ All dieldrin and chlordane values were below method detection limits.

² Dieldrin was not analyzed at targeted stations.




Figure 6. Concentrations of PCBs, DDTs, and PBDEs in plankton and benthic infauna by Bay region. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.




Figure 7. Concentrations of chlordanes and mercury in plankton and benthic infauna by Bay region. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.

Fish

The plots of fish tissue contaminants include only those species for which at least three samples were available from that region of the Bay. Data for additional species, as well as for Bay regions where fewer than three samples were analyzed, are included in Appendix A.

Median total PCB concentrations for the same species of fish were generally highest in the Central Bay, with the lowest concentrations in fish from the South (Figure 8). This pattern differed from the trend seen for sediment, where the highest concentration of PCBs was measured in the North (3-5x higher than other regions).

Relative PCB concentration among species was variable and showed few consistent trends. There was a nearly eight-fold range in concentrations among species for the North and South, with less variability among species for the Central Bay (approximately 3-fold). Spotted sand bass had the highest or second-highest median PCB concentration within each region. The lowest PCB concentrations were frequently measured in small fish that fed primarily on water column organisms (e.g., topsmelt, shiner perch, and killifish). However, relatively high PCB concentrations were also measured in some samples of small fish (e.g., Goby sp. in the North, deepbody anchovy in the Central, and northern anchovy in the South). The highest median PCB concentration (359 ng/g) was obtained for six samples of deepbody anchovy from the Central Bay (Appendix Table A3). The cause of the variations in concentration among species was not determined in this study, but may have been related to differences in diet or feeding location.

Total DDT concentrations in fish were generally about ten-fold lower than PCBs (Figure 8). Median concentrations of DDTs were usually similar in the North and Central, which were approximately two-fold higher than the South. Fish species having the highest median DDT concentrations were shiner perch and barred sand bass in the North, deepbody anchovy and shiner perch in the Central, and barred sand bass and slough anchovy in the South. Deepbody anchovy had the highest median concentration of any species group (28.8 ng/g in the Central). Round stingray, the fish species with the highest PCB concentration in the data set, had amongst the lowest median DDT concentration (0.6 ng/g).

Most fish samples contained detectable levels of mercury, but there was little variation in concentration among regions (Figure 9). The species with the highest median concentrations were spotted sand bass (107 ng/g Central), barred sand bass (69 ng/g South), and deepbody anchovy (69 ng/g Central), respectively.




Figure 8. Concentrations of PCBs, DDTs, and PBDEs in fish by Bay region. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.




Figure 9. Concentrations of chlordanes and mercury in fish by Bay region. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols. Sediment mercury concentrations for North and Central are not shown because they are higher than plot range (440 ng/g for North and 260 ng/g for Central).

Seabirds

Seabird eggs were collected from multiple locations in the North and South; no eggs were obtained from the Central Bay, as there are no nesting areas along the Bay in this region, as delimited. Regional comparisons can only be made for California least tern, as this was the only species having nesting areas in both the North and South.

Among the organic contaminants measured, concentrations of DDTs and PCBs were similar. This pattern differed from the fish, where PCBs were present at approximately ten-fold higher concentrations than DDTs. Caspian tern eggs contained the highest median concentration of each contaminant type measured, except for PCBs, which were slightly more concentrated in western gull eggs (Figures 10 and 11). Double-crested cormorant eggs had amongst the lowest concentrations of chlordanes, mercury, and PBDEs, compared to other species. Total PCBs, DDTs, and PBDEs in western gull eggs, which nest at the north end of the bay, were present in higher concentrations than for California least tern eggs collected from the North region of the Bay.

There was little difference between regions in contaminant concentrations in California least tern eggs. Contaminant concentrations varied between the North and South by less than a factor of two for all contaminant types measured, with no consistent trend. These results indicate little difference in contaminant exposure among Bay regions for this species of special concern.

Contamination of seabird eggs by legacy contaminants is evident throughout the Southern California Bight. Analysis of over 100 seabird egg samples collected during the Bight '13 regional survey detected DDTs and PCBs in virtually every sample, regardless of location (Clatterbuck et al. 2016).

Regional variation in seabird egg contamination was evident for some compounds, as indicated by the data for California least tern eggs, which were collected at nine southern California locations ranging from Pt. Mugu in the north to Tijuana Estuary. Total PCB concentrations in least tern eggs were highest in San Diego Bay, relative to other locations, with approximately twice the concentration measured at northern locations (e.g., Pt. Mugu and Los Angeles Harbor). PBDEs were also highest in least tern eggs from San Diego Bay and Tijuana estuary, likely a reflection of inputs from urban stormwater discharges.

Conversely, there was little regional trend in least tern egg mercury concentrations among the Bight '13 samples, suggesting that mercury exposure is not driven by local contamination patterns. Total DDTs in least tern eggs were lowest in San Diego Bay and highest in samples from Los Angeles Harbor and Pt. Mugu, reflecting the influence of historical DDT contamination on the Palos Verdes Shelf.




Figure 10. Concentrations of PCBs, DDTs, and PBDEs in seabird eggs by Bay region. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.




Figure 11. Concentrations of chlordanes, PFCs, and mercury in seabird eggs by Bay region. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.

BIOACCUMULATION FACTORS

Biota-sediment accumulation factors (BSAF) based on wet weight tissue concentrations and dry weight sediment concentrations were calculated for benthic infauna (Figures 12 and 13), fish (Figures 14 and 15), and seabird eggs (Figures 16 and 17). The BSAF describes the relative amount of bioaccumulation in the organism, normalized to the sediment concentration. As a result of this normalization, the BSAF for a particular sample is independent of the sediment concentration and can therefore be compared to values for other locations or studies. The higher the magnitude of the BSAF for a particular species, the greater the apparent degree of bioamagnification of contaminants from the sediment.

BSAFs are empirically-derived and are based on the assumption that sediment is the predominant source of the bioaccumulated contaminant. As such, BSAFs provide a simple model to estimate levels of bioaccumulation that can be expected as a result of variations in sediment contamination at the study site. Because bioaccumulation is also influenced by factors such as the organism's age, diet, physiology and feeding site, or sediment characteristics, BSAF values should be interpreted with caution. Further normalization of the BSAF to account for variations in tissue lipid content or sediment total organica carbon content generally reduces the influence of confounding factors. A high BSAF value for a species, relative to another species from the same location, generally indicates a difference in diet (e.g., higher trophic level) or body composition (e.g., lipid content) and possible elevated risk for contaminant effects.

Patterns in BSAF among species, taxonomic groups, or regions were similar to those described for chemical concentrations, as the values are calculated using the same sediment concentration data. BSAF values for additional species, those where fewer than three samples were analyzed, are included in Appendix B.

Benthic infauna

Among benthic invertebrates, median BSAFs were highest for DDTs, where tissue concentrations were 20-196 times higher than sediment (Figure 12). Most sediment samples did not contain detectable levels of DDT, but this situation was probably not responsible for the relatively high DDT BSAFs as calculations were based on an estimated value that was likely higher than the true value (tends to reduce BSAF). Infauna also had relatively high BSAFs for PCBs, ranging from 6-41. Bioaccumulation of PBDEs relative to sediment had high variability, with BSAFs ranging from 0.3 to 74.

DDT BSAFs were similar among taxonomic groups, with no apparent trend. There was an apparent trend in PCB BSAFs among taxa in the North and South, with mollusks having lower BSAFs, approximately 10-50% of those calculated for polychaetes or crustaceans.

Regional differences in infauna BSAFs were evident only for DDTs. Infauna in the Central and North regions had median DDT BSAFs that were approximately 1.4-8.5 times greater than South infauna. The cause of this variation was not determined; potential causes include analytical variability related to small sample size or differences in sediment characteristics among Bay regions.

Fish

Fish BSAFs varied widely among species and regions (Figures 14 and 15). For DDTs, median BSAFs ranged from 0.26 (arrow goby in South) to 575 (deepbody anchovy in Central). PCB BSAFs ranged from 6 (topsmelt and shiner perch in North) to 97 (deepbody anchovy in Central). Fish BSAFs were generally three or four-fold higher than invertebrate values for the same Bay region, which is consistent with the higher trophic level of fish.

Regional variation in fish BSAFs was observed for DDTs and PCBs. Fish collected from the Central Bay tended to have higher BSAFs for both contaminant groups, with values approximately two to three times higher than fish in the other regions. The lowest DDT BSAFs were usually noted for South fish, while North fish usually had the lowest BSAFs for PCBs.

Seabirds

BSAFs based on seabird egg contaminant data showed similar trends as described for fish, with DDT BSAFs higher than those for PCBs (Figures 16 and 17). But the magnitude of difference was much greater for seabird eggs, with DDT BSAFs 50-100x higher than egg PCB BSAFs.

Egg PCB BSAFs ranged from 8 to 90, similar to those calculated for fish (6 to 142). DDT BSAFs were vastly different between birds and fish, however. Seabird egg DDT BSAFs ranged from 444 to 7075, approximately 10 to 27,000 times higher than fish BSAFs. Differences in lipid content between fish tissue and eggs likely had a major influence on these BSAFs, as DDTs and PCBs have a strong affinity for tissue lipids.

California least tern BSAFs were generally lower and less variable than for Caspian tern or double-crested cormorant; except for chlordane. However apparent interspecies trends may not be reliable due to data limitations. BSAFs for Caspian tern and double-crested cormorant were based on samples from only a single location, whereas California least tern egg samples were collected from four locations.




Figure 12. BSAF values for PCBs, DDTs, and PBDEs in benthic infauna. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.




Figure 13. BSAF values for chlordanes in benthic infauna. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.




Figure 14. BSAF values for PCBs, DDTs, and PBDEs in fish. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.




Figure 15. BSAF values for chlordanes fish. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.




Figure 16. BSAF values for PCBs, DDTs, and PBDEs in seabird eggs. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.




Figure 17. BSAF values for chlordanes in seabird eggs. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.

NORMALIZED BIOACCUMULATION FACTORS

Lipid and total organic carbon (TOC) normalized BSAFs were calculated for benthic infauna (Figures 18 and 19) and fish (Figures 20 and 21). Calculation of normalized BSAFs allows for the reduction of interferences from variations in sediment TOC content and organism lipid content, which facilitates a more accurate comparison of bioaccumulation among trophic levels, species, and regions. Data for additional fish species, where fewer than three samples were analyzed, are included in Appendix C.

Benthic infauna

Among benthic invertebrates, median normalized BSAFs were still highest for DDTs, where tissue concentrations were 9-41 times higher than sediments. With the normalization to lipid and TOC content, the highest median PBDE BSAF decreased three-fold relative to the non-normalized BSAFs, and the PCB BSAFs decreased 4-fold.

Compared to polychaetes and crustacea, mollusks had 2-3 times lower median BSAFs for DDTs and PCBs in all regions, and 10-70 times lower BSAFs for PBDEs in the North and Central regions of San Diego Bay. This pattern is similar to that observed for non-normalized BSAF values with the exception of the magnitude of difference for PBDEs. PBDEs were the only contaminant to display overall regional differences as well. Crustacea and polychaetes in the North and Central regions had 2-20 times higher BSAFs compared to the South region.

Normalized BSAFs for infauna ranged from 0.4 to 41 for DDTs and PCBs and were frequently higher than expected based on bioaccumulation models. Traditionally, equilibrium partitioning models predict BSAF values in the range of 1-3. However, calculated values based on field samples are frequently outside this range. Analysis of data from Superfund sites by Burkhard et al. (2007) documented BSAF variations of several orders of magnitude. The 99th percentile of those values has been proposed by Burkhard as a benchmark indicating numerically reasonable values, which corresponds to 38.9 for fish and 27.4 for invertebrates. Most of the median BSAFs for San Diego Bay benthic infauna were less than 27.4. However, three median DDT BSAF values exceeded the invertebrate benchmark. While the mechanism for these large values is uncertain, there are a few possible explanations. BSAFs assume equilibrium between sediment, pore water, and organism contaminant concentrations, but don't take into account other modes of exposure such as contaminated food or water column. Also, the sediment contaminant measurements do not account for concentration gradients that frequently occur at the sediment-water interface. Sediment chemistry samples were collected from the top 5 cm of sediment and may not represent contaminant concentrations at the sediment surface or in suspended particles near the sediment surface. Many benthic organisms, in particular crustacea and mollusks, feed at the sediment-water interface. Elevated contaminant concentrations in this top layer could have resulted in greater contaminant bioaccumulation than that expected based on bulk chemistry measurements.

Fish

Normalized BSAFs for fish continued to exhibit a wide range of variability. Median BSAFs for chlordanes ranged from 0.2 (arrow goby in South) to 62 (round stingray in South), with similar ranges for PCBs and PBDEs. Total DDTs had the largest BSAF range, from 0.06 (arrow goby in

South) to 301 (deepbody anchovy in South). In general, fish BSAFs were at least two times higher than benthic BSAFs, consistent with the principles of trophic transfer. The only exception was PBDEs, where only three fish groups (barred sand bass and California halibut in North, and barred sand bass in Central) had elevated median PBDE BSAFs relative to infauna (about two-fold). There were no consistent regional differences in PBDE BSAFs for fish.

The regional differences noted for DDT BSAFs are no longer present with normalization. Regional variation for PCB BSAFs was unchanged with normalization. Central Bay fish tended to have higher BSAFs, followed by South fish and then North fish.

Some of the fish BSAFs exceeded the 99th percentile benchmark: 10 DDT BSAFs, and 1 BSAF each for chlordanes, PCBs, and PBDEs. It is not surprising that some of the BSAFs exceeded the benchmark value as the relationship between fish and sediment is more indirect than for infauna. The possibility of contaminated food sources and water column exposure providing extra inputs to the fish tissue is likely. Similar to the benthic infauna, contaminant exposure in bottom feeding fish may be influenced by concentrations at the sediment-water interface. This sediment may have higher contaminant concentrations relative to the 5 cm layer which was sampled. More investigation is needed in order to determine the cause of the relatively high normalized BSAFs.




Figure 18. Normalized BSAF values for PCBs, DDTs, and PBDEs in benthic infauna. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.




Figure 19. Normalized BSAF values for chlordanes in benthic infauna. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.




Figure 20. Normalized BSAF values for PCBs, DDTs, and PBDEs in fish. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.




Figure 21. Normalized BSAF values for chlordanes in fish. See Figure 5 for description of plot symbols.

RISK TO WILDLIFE

REPRESENTATIVE SPECIES AND EXPOSURE FACTORS

Five avian receptor categories are represented in this assessment. Three are piscivores that consume fish but with different preferences for fish size and/or occurrence in the water column (Caspian tern, California least tern, double-crested cormorant, a fourth category is consumers of benthic invertebrates (surf scoter), and the fifth category is a mixed forager that is a dietary generalist, consuming pelagic aquatic biota, other birds, carrion and human refuse (western gull). Of the piscivores, one is a species of conservation concern (California least tern). Four of the categories are represented by species that nest in colonies around San Diego Bay. Species present during the breeding season rely on aquatic biota from the bay during a critical period in their life cycle, during which adults may experience adverse effects from exposure to contaminants in the diet and offspring may experience adverse effects from exposure as embryos to contaminants that were transferred by the female parent to the egg (Figure 1). Receptors that forage on benthic invertebrates are represented by overwintering species including large numbers of shorebirds, which forage in intertidal habitats and waterfowl that forage in more subtidal areas (Figure 1).

Dietary exposure to contaminants by overwintering adults may adversely affect weight and body condition, which are critical for successful migration to summer breeding grounds. Wintering shorebirds and waterfowl may obtain the nutrition they need to produce eggs at migratory stopovers or at summer breeding grounds. However, birds that start migration with a nutritional deficit (poor body condition) are at risk of reduced survival during migration, and reduced breeding activity and output at breeding grounds. The representative species selected for this assessment are California least tern representing small pelagic foraging piscivores and species of conservation concern (federal and State endangered), Caspian tern representing large pelagic foraging piscivores, double-crested cormorant representing pelagic and bottom foraging piscivores, surf scoter representing bottom foraging consumers of invertebrates, and western gull representing mixed foraging carnivore (fish, invertebrates, birds and refuse).

Species characteristics translate into factors that are used to modify exposure estimates. Seasonal use may be represented by a seasonal use factor (SUF). The seasonal occurrence of receptors at San Diego Bay is noted. However, because representative species are present year-round or at least for months spanning a critical phase of their annual cycle, SUFs were assigned a value of 1.0 (no adjustment to exposure estimate), reflecting the assumption that exposure and potential for adverse effects associated with contaminant exposure while at San Diego Bay is not affected by months spent at other locations. The fraction of food obtained from the site may be represented by an area use factor (AUF). The AUF allows for the possibility that a receptor is obtaining less than 100 percent of its daily intake from the site. For example, a receptor's foraging area may extend beyond the boundaries of San Diego Bay. At 12 miles (19 km) long by 1-3 miles (1.6-4.8 km) wide, San Diego Bay is considered large enough to accommodate foraging ranges of most avian species considered in this assessment, particularly those that are present during the nesting season. The bay also provides a variety of foraging habitats, and abundances of prey species preferred by most of the receptors considered in this assessment (USDON, SWDIV 2013). With few exceptions, a default value of 1.0 is assigned to the AUF,

reflecting the assumption that while present, 100 percent of a receptor's diet is from San Diego Bay.

Daily food ingestion (FI) is species-specific, depends on body mass (hereafter referred to as body weight or BW), and is either measured or estimated using regressions relating FI to BW, depending on available information. Receptor body weights are reported as grams (g) and food ingestion is reported or estimated as grams wet weight (ww) of food per day ($g_{\text{food}} \text{ ww/d}$). Diet composition affects the contaminant level to which a particular receptor is exposed. For example, contaminant levels in the diet of birds that prefer small pelagic fish may be lower than contaminant levels in the diet of birds that consume larger and higher trophic level fish (e.g., see Figure 1). Diet composition for representative species can be generally described but with variation in specifics, depending on what is available. Aquatic biota collected from San Diego Bay and analyzed for this assessment include invertebrates, and what is generally categorized as small benthic fish, small pelagic fish, and medium size demersal fish (Figure 1). The general diet composition for each representative species was used to select which samples of aquatic biota collected from San Diego Bay to factor into estimates of dietary contaminant levels for the receptor group the species represents. General information and assumptions relating to exposure estimates for each representative species are provided in the following profiles.

Profile for California least tern (small pelagic foraging piscivore, and species of conservation concern)

The California least tern was selected to represent small pelagic foraging seabirds, or obligate piscivores, that rely on bay resources during the nesting season. California least tern is a federal and State endangered species, and consequently is a species of conservation concern. The California least tern is the smallest of the North American terns and is found during its nesting season along the Pacific coast of California from San Francisco Bay, California, to Baja California, Mexico. Limited information indicates that the species migrates south to Central and South America for the winter (Massey 1971). California least terns nest in colonies on sandy dunes and flats, or similar habitats created intentionally or unintentionally as a result of human activity. Least tern nesting colonies are found all around San Diego Bay, with colonies on one side or the other in northern, central and southern segments of the bay, and at the Salt Works on the southern end. Only colonies on the eastern side of the bay are represented by eggs collected in 2013, and are of greatest concern for exposure by adults to contaminants from San Diego Bay in their diets.

The California least tern was listed as federally endangered in 1970 and state endangered in 1971, due to population declines from loss of habitat. Subsequent actions to conserve, increase and/or manage habitat have resulted in an increase in statewide numbers from 623 nesting pairs in 1973 (Bender 1974) to approximately 5,000 nesting pairs in 2013. In 2013, approximately 23% of statewide numbers nested in colonies around San Diego Bay (Frost 2014). While overall numbers have increased, the rate of nest success (as number fledged/nest) has been declining, and more so for southern colonies, such as those in San Diego Bay, than for more northern colonies (Lewison and Deutschman 2014). As a species of conservation concern, the California least tern is a high priority species for monitoring numbers and productivity, and for characterizing and managing potential threats to their conservation.

Characteristics that affect potential for exposure

The California least tern is migratory, with individuals typically arriving at nesting sites in April, and departing in late August (TDI 2009 and 2011, USDoN, SWDIV 2013). As such, they are present and rely on resources in San Diego Bay for a critical phase of their life cycle, the breeding period. Because they are present during the nesting season, contaminant exposure by both adults (via diet) and developing embryos (as concentrations in eggs) can be assessed.

California least terns are surface-feeding piscivores that forage in the bay and in nearshore waters of the open ocean (Baird 2010, Leicht 2014, Atwood and Kelly 1984), generally within 3 km of their nest sites (Atwood and Minsky 1983). They are opportunistic, eating fish that are small enough to catch (<6 cm standard length, or SL) and in less than 1 m of water (Atwood and Kelly 1984). California least terns consume primarily young-of-the-year (YOY) of anchovies (Engraulididae) and silversides (Atherinidae, such as topsmelt), but also YOY of surfperch, sculpin, herring and others, depending on availability (Atwood and Kelly 1984, Leicht 2014, Burton and Terrill 2012, Baird 2010). As consumers of fish, least terns are upper trophic level predators (secondary carnivores) of the aquatic-based food web. Fish consumed by least terns include numerous resident species, some of which are year-round residents and others are juveniles of species that spawn in the bay and are bay-only residents prior to migrating out of the system (Allen et al. 2002). Diet composition may change from one year to the next. However, based on data from Atwood and Kelly (1984), it is assumed that least terns nesting in San Diego Bay colonies, especially ones along the eastern and southern shorelines, rely entirely on resident, juvenile, forage fish. Because of their diet and localized foraging habits during the nesting season, California least terns are likely to be exposed to elevated levels of contaminants from San Diego Bay. Because females may transfer contaminants to eggs and developing embryos, contaminant risk to both adults and embryos are evaluated in this assessment.

Direct exposure by developing embryos

Contaminant exposure by developing California least tern embryos was measured directly using chemical analysis of failed-to-hatch eggs.

Dietary exposure factors for adults

Adult least terns weigh between 30 and 45 g (Thompson et al. 1997). Dunning (1984) reports a mean adult body weight for least terns in Kansas of 43 g (± 2.12 g), and Massey (1971) determined that the growth of California least tern fledglings starts to level off at 35 to 40 g. Based on data from Massey (1971) specific to California least terns, 40 g may be considered the low end of adult body weights for California least terns, and as such was the value adopted for this assessment. The daily food ingestion rate for California least tern was estimated using the regression developed by Nagy (2001) for Charadriiformes (gulls, terns, shorebirds, auks). The food ingestion rate for adult California least terns was computed as:

$$\text{FI (g}_{\text{food}} \text{ WW/d)} = 1.914 \times (\text{g BW})^{0.769}, \text{ or}$$
$$\text{FI} = 32.65 \text{ g}_{\text{food}} \text{ WW/d}$$

Incidental ingestion of sediment is expected to be minimal to none for birds that forage in the water column, and therefore is not considered further for this species. Diet composition is

assumed to be forage fish in general that are less than 6 cm SL. Of the species collected from San Diego Bay for this assessment, those less than 6 cm SL and therefore assumed to be part of the least tern diet for estimating contaminant exposure are topsmelt, slough anchovy, northern anchovy, shiner perch, black perch, killifish and gobies. Factors and assumptions used to estimate dietary contaminant exposure to California least terns while nesting in colonies around San Diego Bay are summarized below.

Species	California least tern
BW (g)	40
FI (g _{food} WW/d)	32.65
AUF (unitless)	1
SUF (unitless)	1
Assumed diet composition	topsmelt, slough anchovy, northern anchovy, shiner perch, black perch, killifish and gobies

Profile for Caspian tern (large pelagic foraging piscivore)

The Caspian tern represents large pelagic foraging seabird species. It is the largest of the tern species, and is found on every continent but Antarctica. They nest and winter along coastlines, fresh- and saltwater wetlands, estuaries, coastal bays and beaches. In North America, they breed along the Pacific coast from Alaska to Baja California (Mexico), the Atlantic Coast from Newfoundland to Florida, and the Gulf Coast from Texas to Florida. They also breed in central Canada (Northwest Territories and central provinces), and in north-central United States (USGS 2016). Their wintering range extends from southern California to South America on the Pacific coast and from North Carolina to Central America on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts (USGS 2016). The Salt Works at the southern end is the only location in San Diego Bay where Caspian terns have a nesting colony. With approximately 300 breeding pairs observed annually over decades of surveys, numbers of Caspian terns nesting at the Salt Works are sufficient to be considered continentally significant (USFWS 2006).

Characteristics that affect potential for exposure

While Caspian terns are present throughout the year in San Diego County, the species is mostly a summer visitor to San Diego Bay with greatest numbers occurring during the nesting season from March to September (SDNHM 2016, TDI 2009 and 2011). As such, they are present and rely on resources in San Diego Bay for a critical phase of their life cycle, the breeding period. Because they are present during the nesting season, contaminant exposure by both adults (via diet) and developing embryos (as concentrations in eggs) can be assessed.

Similar to least terns, Caspian terns are surface-feeding piscivores that forage in nearshore waters of bays, estuaries, lakes, and the nearby ocean (Cuthbert and Wires 1999, Balz et al. 1979, Ohlendorf et al. 1985). Caspian terns are reported to have a maximum foraging range of up to 70 km, but the composition of their diets generally reflect the most locally abundant and available forage fish species near (within 25 km of) their nesting colonies (Collis et al. 2012, Roby et al. 2002). Caspian terns catch a variety of fish species with shallow plunge dives in water 0.5 to 5.0 meters deep. The diet composition and size of fish captured by Caspian terns vary with location and seasonal prey availability, but most fish are between 5 and 25 cm in length and the fish are

older at 1+ yrs (Cuthbert and Wires 1999, Balz et al. 1979). Caspian terns nesting in estuarine/marine habitats consume primarily silversides (topsmelt, jack smelt, grunion), surfperches, and anchovies, but also sculpin, gobies, flatfish, juvenile sharks and others, depending on availability (Collis et al. 2012). As consumers of relatively large forage fish, Caspian terns are upper trophic level predators (tertiary carnivores) of the aquatic-based food web that includes numerous fish species found in San Diego Bay. Caspian terns nesting in the San Diego Bay colony have been found to consume a large number of fish species, but topsmelt and other “unidentified atherinids” dominate along with sardines and anchovies (Ohlendorf et al. 1985, Horn and Dahdul 1998 and 1999). The Caspian tern diet is thus a mixture of bay/estuarine residents (e.g., topsmelt, anchovies other than northern anchovy, gobies) and marine species that occur in the ocean nearby, or are seasonally present in San Diego Bay (e.g., northern anchovy and California grunion). Because of their diet and foraging habits during the nesting season, Caspian terns are likely to be exposed to elevated levels of contaminants from San Diego Bay. However, not all of their food is from San Diego Bay. Using data from Horn and Dahdul (1998 and 1999), and assuming that “unidentified atherinids” are mostly topsmelt, it is assumed for this assessment that Caspian tern diet is 5 - 25 cm-long pelagic and demersal forage fish, with only 50% of their daily intake coming from San Diego Bay. Because females may transfer contaminants to eggs and developing embryos, contaminant risk of both adults and embryos are evaluated in this assessment.

Direct exposure by developing embryos

Contaminant exposure by developing Caspian least tern embryos was measured directly by chemical analysis of failed-to-hatch eggs.

Dietary exposure factors for adults

Adult Caspian terns weigh between 530 and 780 g, with means from 623 to 662 g (Cuthbert and Wires 1999, Dunning 1984). Absent body weight data specific to Caspian terns on the Pacific coast of North America, a low-end mean value reported by Cuthbert and Wires (1999) was selected for use in this assessment. The body weight for adult Caspian terns was thus assumed to be 618 g, which is the mean for birds from Michigan, minus one standard deviation. The daily food ingestion rate for Caspian terns was computed using the regression developed by Nagy (2001) for Charadriiformes (gulls, terns, shorebirds, auks), as follows:

$$FI (g_{\text{food}} \text{ ww/d}) = 1.914 \times (g \text{ BW})^{0.769}, \text{ or}$$

$$FI = 268 g_{\text{food}} \text{ ww/d}$$

Incidental ingestion of sediment is expected to be minimal to none for birds that forage in the water column, and therefore is not considered further for this species. Diet composition is assumed to be pelagic/demersal fish between 5 and 25 cm SL. Of the species collected from San Diego Bay for this assessment, those assumed to be part of the Caspian tern diet are topsmelt, slough anchovy, deepbody anchovy, northern anchovy, shiner perch, black perch, barred sand bass and spotted sand bass. Factors and assumptions used to estimate dietary contaminant exposure by Caspian tern adults while nesting in colonies on San Diego Bay are summarized below.

Species	Caspian tern
BW (g)	618
FI (g _{food} WW/d)	268
AUF (unitless)	0.5
SUF (unitless)	1
Assumed diet composition	topsmelt, slough anchovy, deepbody anchovy, northern anchovy, shiner perch, black perch, barred sand bass and spotted sand bass

Profile for Double-crested cormorant (pelagic and benthic-foraging piscivore)

The double-crested cormorant represents large seabird species that forage in mid-water depths and at the bottom of the water column. It is a colonial nesting seabird that occurs generally within sight of land on inland and coastal waterways of North American and northern Mexico (Dorr et al. 2014). Double-crested cormorants breed in Alaska, along the Pacific Coast from British Columbia to Mexico, in interior Canada and northern U.S., and along the Atlantic coast from Newfoundland to New York and Florida to the Caribbean. In the winter, those that breed in the continental interior and along the northern Atlantic coast migrate to southeastern U.S., while cormorants with breeding grounds in the west migrate to the Pacific coast, and some breeding populations do not migrate (Dorr et al. 2014). The double-crested cormorant was listed in 1978 as a California species of special concern (Remsen 1978) due to declines in numbers attributed to human disturbance, loss of nesting habitat, and pollutant impacts on survival and reproduction.

Characteristics that affect potential for exposure

The double-crested cormorant is a common visitor to San Diego County, being most abundant during winter months (SDNHM 2016). San Diego Bay is host to a breeding colony that was formed in 1998 at the southern end of the bay (SDNHM 2016). The breeding colony appears to be non-migratory, with surveys showing a year-round presence of a few hundred birds, supplemented in the fall and early winter by seasonal visitors (e.g., TDI 2009 and 2011, USDoN, SWDIV 2013). The breeding population is present and relies on resources in San Diego Bay for a critical phase of their life cycle, if not the entire year. Because they are present during the nesting season, contaminant exposure to both adults (via diet) and developing embryos (as concentrations in eggs) can be assessed.

Double-crested cormorants are piscivores that forage close to shore in water less than 10 meters deep (Dorr et al. 2014, Granholm 2016, Anderson et al. 2004). They forage by diving from the water surface and swimming after prey occurring near the surface to just above the bottom (Ainley et al. 1981). Foraging range for double-crested cormorants is typically less than 30 km (Dorr et al. 2014), but nest sites tend to be preferentially established within 8 to 10 km of a foraging area (Granholm 2016). Cormorants can be observed in open water throughout San Diego Bay, with greatest numbers occurring during fall in the north, followed by south and south-central segments of the bay (TDI 2009 and 2011). The diet composition and size of fish captured by double-crested cormorants vary with location and seasonal prey availability. However, most fish are slow-moving, schooling, or inshore benthic species, and generally 5-15 cm in length (Dorr et al. 2014, Ainley et al. 1981, Robertson 1974). Species found to be common in the diets of double-crested cormorants from colonies along the Pacific Coast include

atherinids, midshipmen, shiner perch, anchovy, croaker/seabass/corbina (Ainley et al. 1981), along with benthic fish and invertebrates for birds in inshore habitats (Dorr et al. 2014, Robertson 1974, Trapp and Hanisch 2000). As consumers of fish, double-crested cormorants are upper trophic level predators of the aquatic-based food webs. Fish consumed by cormorants include numerous species that occur in San Diego Bay (Allen et al. 2002). Because of their diet and localized foraging habits during the nesting season, double-crested cormorants are likely to be exposed to elevated levels of contaminants from San Diego Bay. Details on the fish consumed by double-crested cormorants from the San Diego Bay are lacking. Based on foraging behavior and food preferences, it is assumed that resident double crested cormorants, especially during the nesting season, obtain 100% of their diet from San Diego Bay and that their diet is a mix of pelagic/demersal/benthic fish 5 - 15 cm SL. Because females may transfer contaminants to eggs and developing embryos, contaminant risk to both adults and embryos are evaluated in this assessment.

Direct exposure by developing embryos

Contaminant exposure by developing double-crested cormorant embryos was measured directly by chemical analysis of failed-to-hatch eggs.

Dietary exposure factors for adults

The body weight of adult double-crested cormorants ranges from approximately 1,200 to 3,000 grams, depending on gender and location (Dorr et al. 2014). Along the east coast and central North America, males tend to be larger than females, and birds from northern colonies are larger than birds from southern colonies (Dorr et al. 2014). To address uncertainty about the body mass of cormorants from the San Diego Bay nesting colony, a low end value from Dunning (1984) was selected for use in this assessment. Body mass was assumed to be 1,540 g, which is a mean reported by Dunning (1984) for females from a colony in Florida, and is lower than commonly used values of 1,800 to 2,000 g in analyses of double-crested cormorant nutritional requirements (Ridgway 2010). The daily food ingestion rate for double-crested cormorants was computed using a regression and factors recommended by Ridgway (2010) specifically for cormorants during the nesting season. In this case, a regression was used to compute the mass-specific daily energy requirements in kilojoules per day (kJ/d), which was then converted to grams diet/day using an average energy density for fish consumed by cormorants (kJ/g diet) adjusted by assimilation efficiency, as follows:

$FI (g_{\text{food}} \text{ ww/day}) = \text{field metabolic rate (kJ/d)} \div \text{metabolizable energy in diet (kJ/g}_{\text{fish}} \text{ ww)}$, where;

Field metabolic rate (kJ/d) = $16.69 (BW \text{ g})^{0.651}$, and

Metabolizable energy (kJ/g_{fish} ww) = gross energy (5.42 kJ/g_{fish} ww) x assimilation efficiency (0.8)

For a 1,540 gram double-crested cormorant;

$FI (g_{\text{food}} \text{ ww/day}) = 1,984 \text{ kJ/d} \div 4.34 \text{ kJ/g}_{\text{fish}} \text{ ww} = 458 (g_{\text{fish}} \text{ ww/day})$

Because of foraging habits, double-crested cormorants may experience some incidental ingestion of sediment. However, exposure via ingestion of sediment is assumed to be insignificant, given that most of their foraging is in the water column. Their diet is assumed to consist of pelagic/demersal/benthic fish 5 to 15 cm SL. Medium to large benthic invertebrates (primarily crustaceans) may be consumed by cormorants as well. Of the species collected from San Diego Bay for this assessment, those assumed to be part of the cormorant diet are topsmelt, slough anchovy, northern anchovy, deepbody anchovy, black perch, shiner perch, spotted sand bass, striped sand bass, and California halibut. Unfortunately, large crustaceans were not sampled. Factors and assumptions used to estimate dietary contaminant exposure by double-crested cormorants while nesting in colonies on San Diego Bay are summarized below.

Species	Double-crested cormorant
BW (g)	1,540
FI (g _{food} WW/d)	458
AUF (unitless)	1
SUF (unitless)	1
Assumed diet composition	topsmelt, slough anchovy, northern anchovy, deepbody anchovy, black perch, shiner perch, spotted sand bass, barred sand bass, and California halibut

Profile for Surf scoter (benthic-foraging consumer of invertebrates)

The surf scoter is a large sea duck that is common along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts in the winter and breeds on fresh water boreal lakes and tundra of Canada and Alaska (Anderson et al. 2015). San Diego Bay supports continentally significant numbers of surf scoter, and perhaps the largest concentration of the species in its winter range (SDNHM 2016, USFWS 2006). Surf scoters are the most abundant avian species on San Diego Bay with peak numbers observed at any one time of >5,000 during 2006/2007 surveys and >10,000 during 2009/2010 surveys (TDI 2009 and 2011). Appreciable continental declines in numbers have been reported in the past, but there is a great deal of uncertainty in counts (Anderson et al. 2015). Results of waterbird surveys by TDI (2009 and 2011), suggest that numbers in San Diego Bay may be declining with a total of 27,357 birds observed in 2006/2007 versus a total of 14,327 birds observed in 2009/2010, but additional surveys would be required to draw any conclusions. As overwintering waterfowl, surf scoters rely on resources in San Diego Bay for maintaining weight and body condition which are critical for successful migration to summer breeding grounds. Scoters may obtain the nutrition they need to produce eggs at migratory stopovers or at summer breeding grounds. However, birds that start migration with a nutritional deficit are at risk of reduced survival during migration, and reduced breeding activity and output at breeding grounds.

Characteristics that affect potential for exposure

Surf scoters can be seen on San Diego Bay throughout the year, but peak numbers occur between late fall (November) and early spring (March). Non-migratory birds observed during summer months are believed to be non-breeding and immature birds (Anderson et al. 2015). Surf scoters are most often found in central and southern portions of the bay in water that is 1.5 to 11 meters deep (5 to 35 feet; USDoN, SWDIV 2013, SDNHM 2016, TDI 2011). They dive for prey on or near the bottom, eating mostly mussels and other mollusks (Anderson et al. 2015), but they may

also consume large quantities of herring roe if present (Lewis et al. 2007). Surf scoters may also incidentally ingest sediment while foraging for food. Because of their feeding habits, surf scoters represent waterfowl that are closely linked through diet to sediment-borne contaminants in San Diego Bay. As consumers of benthic invertebrates, surf scoters are mid-trophic level predators of aquatic food web organisms that are resident in San Diego Bay. Of the avian species considered in this assessment, surf scoters are likely to encounter the highest dietary concentrations of contaminants that are bioaccumulated but not biomagnified in the food web (e.g., PAHs). Because of their diet and foraging habits, surf scoters are likely to be exposed to elevated levels of at least some contaminants from San Diego Bay. It is assumed for this assessment that overwintering surf scoters obtain 100% of their food from San Diego Bay.

Direct exposure by developing embryos

Surf scoters are not present during the breeding season, and therefore direct exposure by developing embryos was not addressed in this assessment.

Dietary exposure factors for adults

Adult surf scoters have an overall average body weight of approximately 1,153 g (Ouellet et al. 2013). However, females are smaller than males (Anderson et al. 2015), with reported average body weights of 900 to 985 g for females and 1050 to 1769 g for males. To address risks to benthic-feeding waterfowl of all sizes, the lowest mean value of 900 g for surf scoters was selected for estimating daily ingestion rates. Absent data specific to the species, a daily food ingestion rate for scoter was computed using the regression developed by Nagy (2001) for carnivorous avian species. The food ingestion rate was computed using the following equation:

$$FI (g_{\text{food}} \text{ ww/d}) = 3.048 \times (\text{g BW})^{0.665}, \text{ or}$$

$$FI = 281 \text{ g}_{\text{food}} \text{ ww/d}$$

Incidental ingestion of sediment was also considered for surf scoter. In studies by Beyer et al. (2008), incidental ingestion of sediments by surf scoters was equivalent to 8.6% of daily food intake, as grams dry weight. Although estimated from daily food intake, sediment is assumed to have no nutritional value, so that the estimated daily ingestion of sediment is considered to be in addition to the daily food ingestion rate needed to meet nutritional requirements. For this assessment, a factor of 0.086 was applied to a dry food (dw) food ingestion rate ($g_{\text{food}} \text{ dw/d}$) estimated using the regression from Nagy (2001) for carnivorous avian species as follows:

$$SI (g_{\text{sediment}}/\text{d}) = 0.086 \times [0.849 \times (\text{BW g})^{0.663}], \text{ where}$$

$$SI = \text{daily sediment ingestion} = 6.6 \text{ g}_{\text{sediment}} \text{ dry/day}$$

The scoter diet is assumed to consist of benthic invertebrates. Herring roe may be consumed as well, but while herring may spawn in San Diego Bay, roe was not collected for this assessment. Of the species collected from San Diego Bay for this assessment, those assumed to be part of the surf scoter diet are bivalve mollusks (mussels and clams), polychaete worms and benthic

crustaceans. Factors and assumptions used to estimate dietary contaminant exposure by surf scoters while wintering in San Diego Bay are summarized below.

Species	Surf scoter
BW (g)	900
FI (g _{food} WW/d)	281
SI (g _{sediment} dry/d)	6.6
AUF (unitless)	1
SUF (unitless)	1
Assumed diet composition	Clams, mussels, polychaetes, and crustaceans

Profile for Western gull (mixed foraging carnivore)

The western gull represents large and abundant mixed foraging carnivore. It is a large gull found on the Pacific coast of North America from Vancouver Island to the southern tip of the Baja California peninsula (Mexico) and breeding from northern Washington state to central Baja California (Pierotti and Annett 1995). It is the largest and most numerous of the gull species that occur in San Diego County (SDNHM 2016). The western gull typically breeds in colonies on offshore islands and rocks along the coast (Peirotti and Annett 1995). However, western gulls occur throughout the year in San Diego Bay, and have nest sites at Naval Air Station, North Island, near the mouth of the bay (USDoN, SWDIV 2013). Because they are present during the nesting season, contaminant exposure by both adults (via diet) and developing embryos (as concentrations in eggs) can be assessed.

Characteristics that affect potential for exposure

Western gulls are observed throughout San Diego Bay, but with largest numbers occurring routinely in the north (especially around the bait barge), and occasionally at the Salt Works in the south (TDI 2011). Western gulls are generalist predators of marine pelagic and intertidal fish and invertebrates. They are surface foragers, and when in deeper waters they take prey only in the top 1 to 2 meters (Pierotti and Annett 1995). The composition of their diet is highly variable, and depends on their location, year and season. In general, their primary dietary items are small fish, marine invertebrates (e.g. squid, crabs, and euphausiids) in water less than 2 meters deep, and human refuse. They also consume carrion, and eggs and chicks of other birds. Based on observations of island colonies, as summarized by Pierotti and Annett (1995), fish constitute roughly 60 - 80% of the diet, invertebrates constitute 6-30% of the diet and refuse is less than 10%. The proportion of refuse may be much higher at some locations, or when the supply of other foods is poor, such as during El Nino years. Although their diet is highly varied, western gulls for the most part are upper trophic level predators of aquatic food web organisms. Fish and invertebrates consumed by western gulls include species that occur in San Diego Bay. Consequently, Western gulls are likely to be exposed to elevated levels of contaminants from San Diego Bay in their diet. However, the fraction of diet and contaminant exposure that comes from San Diego Bay is difficult to discern. Absent data specific to San Diego Bay, it is assumed that Western gulls obtain 90 percent of their daily food from San Diego Bay while nesting on North Island, and 10 percent of their daily food from upland sources. Because the gulls are

present during the nesting season and that females may transfer contaminants to eggs, contaminant risk to both adults and embryos are evaluated in this assessment.

Direct exposure by developing embryos

Contaminant exposure by developing Western gull embryos was measured directly by chemical analysis of failed-to-hatch eggs.

Dietary exposure factors for adults

Adult western gulls have an overall average body weight of approximately 1,011 g (Dunning 1984). However, females are smaller than males (Pierotti and Annett 1995), with reported average body weights of 770 to 880 g for females and 930 to 1,136 g for males. To address risks to mixed foragers of all sizes, the lowest mean value of 770 g for western gulls was selected for estimating daily ingestion rates. Absent data specific to the species, a daily food ingestion rate for western gull was computed using the regression developed by Nagy (2001) for Charadriiformes (gulls, terns, shorebirds, auks), as follows:

$$FI (g_{\text{food}} \text{ WW/d}) = 1.914 \times (\text{g BW})^{0.769}, \text{ or}$$

$$FI = 317 \text{ g}_{\text{food}} \text{ WW/d}$$

Western gulls may experience some incidental ingestion of sediment, but it is assumed to be insignificant for this assessment because much of their foraging while in San Diego Bay is expected to be in the water column. Their diet, while foraging in San Diego Bay is assumed to be fish and medium to large pelagic invertebrates in the upper 2 meters of water. Pelagic invertebrates that might be consumed by western gulls were not collected as part of this study. Of the fish species collected for this assessment, those assumed to constitute the western gull diet are topsmelt, northern anchovy, slough anchovy and deepbody anchovy. Factors and assumptions used to estimate dietary contaminant exposure by western gulls while nesting in colonies on San Diego Bay are summarized below.

Species	Western gull
BW (g)	770
FI (g _{food} WW/d)	317
AUF (unitless)	0.9
SUF (unitless)	1
Assumed diet composition	topsmelt, northern anchovy, slough anchovy and deepbody anchovy

SUMMED CONCENTRATIONS OF MIXTURES

The PCBs, PBDEs, DDT and metabolites, and chlordanes are chemical classes for which concentrations of multiple individual compounds were measured. While it was desirable to know the measured concentrations of the individual components, it was also desirable to have an estimate of the concentrations of the mixtures as a whole. DDT and its metabolites are typically found together, and consequently referred to collectively as total DDT. Studies on effects of DDT often focus on specific isomers, especially DDE. For this analysis, total DDT is used to characterize DDT exposure, and comparisons with literature-based thresholds presented as total

DDT or DDE. The total DDT concentration is the sum of the concentrations of six isomers (o,p- and p,p' DDT, o,p- and p,p' DDE, and o,p- and p,p' DDD). The total chlordane concentration is the sum of the concentrations for major constituents in technical grade chlordane (α - and γ -chlordane, *cis*- and *trans*-nonachlor) and the primary metabolite oxychlordane (as applied by USEPA 1992). Concentrations of total PBDEs were computed as the sum of the detected congeners. Concentrations of total PCBs were computed as the sums of the detected congeners, further adjusted using a regression similar to that used by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA 1989 and 1993) for estimating total PCB concentrations from the sum of a fraction of the 209 possible congeners. Egg samples for this study were analyzed for 41 PCB congeners, and as such may underestimate the values for comparison with literature-based total PCB concentrations as estimated using the Aroclor standard approach, or as sums of 90 or more congeners, or sums of homologs. Data from studies by Zeeman et al. (2008) on PCBs in eggs of California least tern, elegant tern, Caspian tern, and black skimmer were analyzed to characterize the relationship between the total PCB concentration as the sum of the 41 congeners (this study), versus total PCB concentrations estimated as; (1) the sum of detected concentrations for 96 congeners, (2) the sum of ten homolog classes, and (3) as estimated using the Aroclor standard approach (Zeeman et al. 2008 study). In the earlier study, total PCB concentrations based on the sum of the concentrations of detected congeners (out of 96) was the same as for the other two measures and as such represents actual total PCB concentrations. The least squares linear regression relating the sum of 41 Bight '13 congeners to total PCBs for black skimmer, elegant tern, Caspian tern and California least tern eggs from San Diego Bay colonies (Zeeman et al. 2008) was used to estimate total PCB concentrations for this study. Total PCB concentrations were computed from sums of concentrations of Bight'13 congeners using:

$$\text{Total PCBs } (\mu\text{g/kg fw}) = 75.2 \mu\text{g/kg fw} + 1.17 (\sum \mu\text{g/kg fw Bight '13 congeners})$$

Toxic equivalent concentrations (TEQs) of twelve dioxin-like PCB congeners were computed for mixtures of the dioxin-like PCB congeners in aquatic biota and seabird eggs using Toxic Equivalent Factors (TEFs) for avian species from Harris and Elliott (2011). The concentration of each congener was multiplied by its respective TEF to produce a TCDD equivalent concentration. The TEQ is the sum of the estimated equivalent concentrations of the twelve dioxin-like congeners.

EXPOSURE POINT CONCENTRATIONS (IN EGGS AND DIET)

Exposure point concentrations (EPCs) developed for this assessment include those measured in avian eggs, for direct exposure by developing embryos, and those measured in food web organisms, for dietary exposure by adults. Concentrations of all contaminants, other than mercury and PFC compounds are evaluated as mixtures, as described previously.

Concentrations of contaminants measured in avian eggs were evaluated on an egg-by-egg basis. Concentrations of contaminants measured in aquatic biota samples (and sediment) were averaged to reflect what is in the diet of the avian receptors, which is a mix of forage species and individuals within a species. Dietary EPCs used in this assessment are means (to reflect diet composition), and maxima (for worst-case scenario).

Data on concentrations of each contaminant were first grouped by taxon and then by the region of the bay from where samples were collected. Data were summarized (mean, median standard

deviation, range and N) in two formats; one in which data are grouped by species only (for bay-wide EPCs), and the other in which data are grouped by species and bay region (for north, central and south bay EPCs).

The summary data were further grouped to reflect the mixes of species consumed by the different receptors, as described previously. The weighted average and maximum concentrations of contaminants in the mix of species consumed by each receptor were determined. Both bay wide and bay region-scale EPCs were estimated to assess risks to avian species that may forage over the entire bay or that may favor particular regions. Species-specific EPCs are used estimate daily dietary dose rates that are then used to characterize risk, as described in the following sections. The EPCs along with the types and number of samples factored into each EPCs are provided in tables summarizing daily dose and hazard quotient estimates (see Appendix F).

EXPOSURE ESTIMATES (CONCENTRATIONS IN EGGS AND DAILY DOSE RATES FOR ADULTS)

Contaminant exposure was characterized two ways; as measured concentrations in eggs, and as estimated daily dietary dose rate, computed from measured concentrations in aquatic biota (EPCs; food items), combined with species-specific food ingestion rates. Each has advantages and limitations.

Concentrations in eggs are directly measured wet weight-based values, adjusted if necessary for loss of moisture in the sample (see egg processing methods). The results are fresh weight-based concentrations ($\text{ng}_{\text{contaminant}} / \text{g}_{\text{eggfw}}$) and are directly comparable to wet weight and fresh weight-based values reported in the literature. Contaminant exposure during embryonic development is considered chronic and concentrations in eggs provide a direct measure of chronic contaminant exposure to developing embryos that can be related to adverse effects specific to embryos (e.g., malformations, edema, embryo lethality, reduced hatchability). Limitations of this approach for assessing contaminant risks are (1) not all contaminants of interest are persistent enough, and /or lipophilic or protein-philic enough to be transferred in significant amounts by the female parent to developing eggs (e.g., PAHs, numerous inorganics, perchlorate), and (2) except for uptake of some compounds from direct contact (e.g., petroleum hydrocarbons), contaminant levels in eggs result from exposure by the female parent only. Levels of some contaminants in eggs have been related to adverse effects in the parents (e.g., DDE effects on eggshell production by the female parent). However, for most contaminants, characterizing such relationships quantitatively is difficult, at best. An assessment of contaminant levels in the diet provides an alternate line of evidence on contaminant exposure and risk of impacts in adult birds

Daily ingested dose is an estimate of the daily intake of a contaminant as nanograms per gram of body mass per day ($\text{ng}_{\text{chemical}} / \text{g}_{\text{BW-d}}$) by a specific receptor via one or multiple exposure routes. For reasons given earlier (conceptual model), the only exposure route considered in this assessment is ingestion, more specifically ingestion of food and in one case, incidental ingestion of sediment. Daily intake via ingestion was estimated using the following equation:

Daily Intake ($\text{ng}/\text{g}_{\text{BW-d}}$) = $[(\text{EPC}_{\text{diet}} \times \text{FI}_w/\text{BW}) + (\text{EPC}_{\text{sediment}} \times \text{SI}_d/\text{BW})] \times (\text{EMFs})$, where:

EPC_{diet} = Exposure Point Concentration of chemical in food (i.e., ng/g ww)

$\text{EPC}_{\text{sediment}}$ = Exposure Point Concentration of chemical in sediment (i.e., ng/ng dw)

FI_w = Species-specific fresh matter food intake rate ($g_{\text{food}}/\text{day}$)

SI_d = Species-specific dry matter sediment intake rate ($g_{\text{sediment}}/\text{day}$)

BW = Body weight of receptor (g)

EMF = Exposure modifying factors (unitless; default = 1.0 with few exceptions)

Incidental ingestion of sediment was factored into exposure estimates for one receptor only, as represented by surf scoter. As a routine forager of benthic invertebrates, surf scoter is more likely than the pelagic foragers considered in this assessment to ingest sediment. Because analytical results reported for biota are wet weight-based while results reported for sediment are dry weight-based, daily intake from diet and daily intake from sediment had to be computed separately. Once done, however, daily intake from diet is added directly to daily intake from sediment for an estimated total daily intake by ingestion. Ingestion rates, which reflect daily nutritional requirements, vary among species and with body weight. Assumptions and calculations used to derive values for FI_w and SI_d are provided with the profiles of representative species discussed earlier.

Of the EMFs, those that are most commonly used are the SUF and the AUF, as previously described (see representative species profiles). A third commonly used EMF is the fraction of ingested contaminant that is absorbed into the receptor's system (i. e., absorbance factor or ABS). Percent absorption of a contaminant from ingested food is compound-specific. For this assessment, percent absorption was assumed to be 100% (factor of 1.0) in all cases, which is a conservative default assumption used in the absence of data to support the use of a lesser value.

As described previously, both a mean and a maximum contaminant-specific EPC was developed for each of the representative species, and assuming bay-wide or regional use of the bay for foraging. All EPCs were entered into estimates of dose rates, resulting in two estimates of dietary exposure for each species (mean daily dose rate and maximum daily dose rate), given use of the entire bay or of specific bay regions for foraging. Estimated daily doses, with corresponding EPCs and assumptions are provided in tables summarizing daily dose and hazard quotient estimates (See Appendix F).

SELECTION OF REFERENCE VALUES TO CHARACTERIZE RISK

Data on contaminant levels in avian eggs were compared with literature-based concentrations associated with adverse effects (Table 8). As indicated previously, contaminant concentrations in eggs are reported as ng/g fw. Risks posed to adults by dietary exposure to contaminants are assessed by comparing species-specific estimated daily dose rates ($ng_{\text{chemical}}/g_{\text{BW-d}}$) with literature based reference dose rates (also as $ng_{\text{chemical}}/g_{\text{BW-d}}$), or Toxicity Reference Values (TRVs) for avian species (Table 9). A description of the process used to determine contaminant threshold concentrations in eggs and TRVs is contained in Appendix D.

RISK CHARACTERIZATION PROTOCOLS

Risks posed to developing seabird embryos by direct exposure to contaminants and by adults through dietary exposure to contaminants were evaluated in two phases. The first is an initial screen in which worst case comparisons are made to identify those contaminants that are of concern and those that are not. The second is a refined assessment that factors in site-specific conditions, and consideration of multiple reference values for perspective on the likelihood that adverse effects may actually occur.

Initial Screen

Study results were subjected to an initial screen to help focus the assessment, by filtering out contaminants and/or receptors for which concerns are minimal to none. For developing embryos, the maximum concentration observed in eggs of each species were compared with lowest NOAECs from Table 8. Screening was done on a contaminant-by-contaminant basis, and concentrations in eggs were evaluated in greater detail for any of the species for which the maximum concentration exceeded the lowest NOAEC.

Table 8. Screening levels used to evaluate contaminant levels in seabird eggs collected from San Diego Bay colonies in 2013.

NOAEC/LOAEC	(ng/g _{eggfw})	Contaminant (effects)	Source
Mercury (egg hatchability, embryo mortality)			
NOAEC	300	estimated from LOAEC (egret)	Shore et al. 2011
LOAEC(s)	600	5 th percentile all species (<lowest LOAEC for all species)	Shore et al. 2011
	800	Low (snowy egret; field based)	Shore et al. 2011
	1,300	Mid (common loon; field based)	Shore et al. 2011
	3,700	High (common tern; field based)	Shore et al. 2011
DDTs (productivity, eggshell thinning)			
NOAEC	200	eggshell thinning	Blus 2011
	1,000	reduced productivity	Blus 2011
LOAEC(s) – prod.	3,000	sensitive species (brown pelican)	Blus 2011
	5,000	Mid-range (e. g. double-crested cormorant & Caspian tern)	Blus 2011
LOAEC(s) - thinning	600	Sensitive species (pelican)	Blus 2011
	10,000	Mid-range (e. g. double-crested cormorant)	Blus 2011
Total PCBs (productivity, parental behavior)			
NOAEC	100	Adjusted LOAEC for most sensitive species	Harris & Elliott 2011
	2,300	Adjusted LOAEC for waterbirds and raptors ¹	Harris & Elliott 2011
LOAEC(s)	1,000	Most sensitive species (chickens)	Harris & Elliott 2011
	6,000	Medium sensitivity species (perching birds)	Harris & Elliott 2011
	23,000	Low sensitivity species (terns, gulls raptors)	Harris & Elliott 2011
PCB 126 (embryo lethality)			
NOAEC	0. 11	Adjusted LOAEC for most sensitive species (chickens)	
	6. 5	Adjusted LOAEC seabirds and raptors	Harris & Elliott 2011
LOAEC(s)	1. 1	Highly sensitive species (chickens)	Harris & Elliott 2011
	24. 0	Medium sensitivity species (bobwhite quail)	Harris & Elliott 2011
	65. 0	Least sensitive species (cormorant, tern, raptor)	Harris & Elliott 2011
TEQ (embryo lethality)			
NOAEC	0. 018	Adjusted LOAEC for most sensitive species	Harris & Elliott 2011
	0. 4	Adjusted LOAEC for waterbirds	Harris & Elliott 2011
LOAEC(s)	0. 18	Highly sensitive species (chickens)	Harris & Elliott 2011
	1. 0	Medium sensitivity (pigeon, pheasant, quail)	Harris & Elliott 2011
	4. 0	Low sensitivity (cormorant, heron, wood duck)	Harris & Elliott 2011
PBDEs (egg hatchability, fertility of offspring)			
NOAEC	180	Bounded NOAEC sensitive species	McKernan et al. 2009
LOAEC(s)	288	sensitive species	McKernan et al. 2009
PFOS (offspring survival)			
NOAEC	1,000	Adjusted LOAEC for more sensitive of two species	Newsted et al. 2005
LOAEC(s)	62,000	More sensitive of two species (mallard less sensitive)	Newsted et al. 2005

¹. All but most sensitive (chickens) (including terns, gull and raptors)

Table 9. Toxicity Reference Values (TRVs) - dose rates used to evaluate risks posed by contaminants in the diet to aquatic-dependent birds of San Diego Bay

NOAEL/LOAEL	(ng/g _{BW} -d)	Contaminant (most sensitive effects)	Source
Mercury (reproduction, parental behavior, productivity)			
NOAEL	4.0	5 th percentile NOAEL all species	Zhang et al. 2013
	7.0	Sensitive species	USFWS 2003
	21	Less sensitive species (obligate piscivores – seabirds)	USFWS 2003
LOAEL	10	Most Sensitive species (ibis)	Zhang et al. 2013
	180	Mid-range (all species considered; based on mallard)	DTSC/HERD 2009
Total DDTs (based on productivity, survival and growth)			
NOAEL	9.0	most sensitive species (pelican)	DTSC/HERD 2009
	227	less sensitive species	EPA 2007
LOAEL	27	most sensitive species	EPA 1995
	1,500	Mid-range all species	DTSC/HERD 2009
Total PCBs (based on egg production, fertility, and hatchability)			
NOAEL	90	Estimated for most sensitive species	DTSC/HERD 2009
LOAEL	1,270	Mid-range, all species (mostly non-waterbirds)	DTSC/HERD 2009
TEQ (based on egg production, hatchability)			
NOAEL	0.0011	Estimated, for most sensitive species (chickens)	Su et al. 2014
LOAEL	0.0495	Lowest for species other than most sensitive	Su et al. 2014
	0.178	Mid-range for all species considered (incl. mallards)	Su et al. 2014
PBDEs (reproductive behavior, egg quality, productivity)			
NOAEL	9.6	Adjusted LOAEL- sensitive species ¹	Fernie et al. 2009
LOAEL	96	Sensitive species ¹	Fernie et al. 2009
Chlordanes (survival)			
NOAEL	160	sensitive species ²	Stickel et al. 1983
LOAEL	7,000	Sensitive species ²	Stickel et al. 1983
LPAHs (weight and food consumption)			
NOAEL	295	Sensitive effect in species of unknown relative sensitivity	Klasing 2007
LOAEL	4,730	Sensitive effect in species of unknown relative sensitivity	Klasing 2007
HPAHs (infertility)			
NOAEL	14.3	Sensitive effect in species of unknown relative sensitivity	Hough et al. 1993
LOAEL	1,430	Sensitive effect in species of unknown relative sensitivity	Hough et al. 1993

¹. Only kestrels, mallards and terns studied (mallards and terns \leq sensitivity of kestrels; Rattner et al. 2011)

². Based on acute toxicity tests with multiple upland species and mallards (Eisler 1990)

For dietary exposure by adult seabirds and waterfowl, maximum concentrations of contaminants in aquatic biota were compared with risk-based dietary screening levels estimated for each representative species using lowest NOAELs in Table 9 and species-specific food ingestion rates provided with species profiles. Screening levels were computed for each contaminant and representative species as follows:

Screening level (ng/g ww) = selected TRV \div (FI/BW), where

Screening level = concentration in the avian diet (aquatic biota)

The selected TRV = lowest contaminant-specific NOAEL (ng_{contaminant}/gBW-d)

FI = species-specific fresh food ingestion rate (g_{food} fw/d), and

BW = species-specific body weight (g)

The resulting initial dietary screening levels (Table 10) are conservative, in that they are based on lowest NOAELs. Also, while they are species-specific, they do not take into consideration site-specific exposure modifying factors (e.g., AUFs) and, as applied, there are no assumptions about diet composition.

Table 10. Initial risk-based screening levels for contaminants in the diet (aquatic biota) of selected avian species that forage in San Diego Bay.

Receptor category →	forager on benthic invertebrates	small piscivore pelagic	large piscivore pelagic/demersal	Large piscivore all depths & benthic	Generalist pelagic & terrestrial
Representative sp. →	Surf scoter	CA least tern	Caspian tern	D-C cormorant	Western gull
Analyte ↓	Screening concentrations (ng/g ww)				
Mercury	12.8	4.9	9.2	13.5	25.2
DDTs	29	11	21	30	57
PCBs	288	110	207	303	566
PCB TEQ	0.0035	0.0014	0.0025	0.0037	0.0069
PBDEs	31	12	22	32	60
Chlordanes	513	196	369	539	1,006
LPAHs	946	362	680	993	1,855
HPAHs	46	18	33	48	90

For the initial screen, the maximum concentration of each contaminant measured in aquatic biota collected from San Diego Bay was compared with the risk-based screening levels in Table 10. Contaminants for which the maximum concentration exceeded any of the avian dietary risk-based screening levels were evaluated in greater detail as part of the refined risk characterization. Conversely, contaminants for which no samples exceeded screening levels were deemed to be of minimal to no concern, and not considered further.

Contaminants that exceed initial screening levels are defined as contaminants of potential concern (COPCs) and are evaluated further in the refined risk characterization.

Refined Risk Characterization

Only contaminants identified as COPCs from the initial screen were subject to more detailed analysis of risks to avian receptors. The refined assessment is more site-specific and/or includes consideration of the potential for adverse effects occurring.

For contaminant levels in seabird eggs, the more refined assessment simply entailed comparisons with multiple screening levels, including LOAECs to provide perspective on the likelihood that impacts on organismal functions related to survival, growth and reproduction will occur and to be detectable under field conditions.

For risks to adults from dietary exposure, estimated dose rates were compared with TRVs using the hazard quotient approach (HQ). The hazard quotient is a unitless value computed as follows:

HQ = species-specific daily dose rate for an individual contaminant / reference dose rate (TRV) for the same contaminant.

As described earlier (exposure estimates), dose (intake) rates were calculated using data on contaminant levels in food web organisms from San Diego Bay, combined with species-specific assumptions about food preferences and use of San Diego Bay for foraging. The resulting dose rates are both species- and site-specific. Mean and maximum EPCs were used to derive mean and maximum dietary dose rates for each receptor exposed to each contaminant of concern in food web organisms, and given that the receptor may use the entire bay for foraging (bay-wide estimates) or limits foraging to any of three sub-regions within the bay (North, Central or South).

All of the estimated dose rates (means and maxima; baywide or by region) for each contaminant were divided by multiple TRVs from Table 9, resulting in a range of HQs for each representative species. An HQ>1 is considered to be of concern. However, the level of concern depends in part on the extent to which the HQ exceeds a value of 1 and the conservativeness of the exposure estimate, and/or the TRV. Using HQs computed for one exposure dose but with multiple TRVs provides some perspective on the potential for adverse effects to occur or be detected under field conditions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Initial Screen

Contaminant levels detected in seabird eggs are summarized in sections on individual contaminants. However, results of the initial screen are summarized below (Table 11) and indicate that, based on potential for adverse effects in developing embryos, that mercury, DDTs, PCBs (total PCBs and TEQs), and PBDEs are contaminants of potential concern for at least one of the seabird species sampled (Caspian tern), and that PCBs are a contaminant of potential concern for all of the species sampled. Of the remaining target analytes, there are no initial determinations for chlordane (no applicable screening levels), PAHs (not analyzed in eggs), or PCB 126 which was detected infrequently but is captured in the TEQ.

Contaminant levels in aquatic biota, and comparisons between mean and maximum concentrations with NOAEC-based dietary screening levels for avian receptors are summarized, by taxon, in Appendix E (Tables E1-E6). Overall results of the initial screen (Table 12) indicate that mercury, DDT, PCBs (as total PCBs and TEQs) and PBDEs in aquatic food web organisms are contaminants of potential concern for most if not all avian receptor categories and that HPAHs are contaminants of potential concern for avian receptors that consume benthic invertebrates. Chlordane and LPAHs were below levels of potential concern for all avian receptors.

Table 11. Maximum contaminant concentrations detected (ng/g fw) in seabird eggs collected from San Diego Bay nesting colonies in 2013, as compared with most conservative (lowest) screening levels for adverse effects. Shading indicates exceedance of screening levels.

Analyte	California least tern	Caspian tern	Double-crested cormorant	Western gull	Lowest SL
Mercury	270	1,020	192	126	300
DDTs	193	2,766	3,644	1,003	200
PCBs	877	1,276	2,358	1,072	100
PCB 126*	with TEQ	with TEQ	with TEQ	with TEQ	0.011
TEQ	0.278	0.331	0.082	0.058	0.018
PBDE	102	414	280	304	180
PFOS	72	63			1,000
Chlordane	17.5	24.6	3.5	4.1	No SL
PAH	not analyzed	not analyzed	not analyzed	not analyzed	

*Due to very low detection, risk associated with PCB 126 was not evaluated separately, but in combination with other dioxin-like congeners as part of the PCB TEQ.

Table 12. Results of initial screen for contaminants of potential concern (identified by ✓) for avian species that forage in San Diego Bay, based on maximum concentrations in aquatic food web organisms (fish and/or benthic invertebrates).

Receptor group (representative species) →	benthic feeding waterfowl (surf scoter)	small pelagic piscivore (California least tern)	large pelagic piscivore (Caspian tern)	large piscivore pelagic/demersal/benthic (double-crested cormorant)	generalist aquatic/non-aquatic (Western gull)
Mercury	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
DDTs	✓	✓	✓	✓	-
PCBs	✓	✓	✓	✓	-
PCB TEQs	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
PBDEs	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Chlordane	-	-	-	-	-
HPAHs	✓	✓**	✓**	✓**	✓**
LPAHs	-	-	-	-	-

- denotes no exceedances, ✓ denotes exceedance by maximum concentration.

** Exceedances occur in benthic invertebrates only

Based on the initial screen, COPCs for seabirds and waterfowl that forage in subtidal areas of San Diego Bay are mercury, DDT, PCBs (total and TEQs), PBDEs and HPAHs.

REFINED ASSESSMENT

Exposure and potential risks posed to avian receptors by direct exposure by embryos (in eggs) and dietary exposure by adults to COPCs are summarized on a contaminant-by-contaminant basis in the following sections. Summary data on contaminant levels in eggs and HQ estimates are provided with the discussions. Tables showing more detail on dietary exposure and risk calculations are provided in Appendices F and G.

Mercury

Mercury concentrations in seabird eggs are summarized below (Table 13). Estimated dietary mercury concentrations and HQs for adult avian receptors are provided in Tables F1 and G1, and summarized below.

Mercury concentrations in eggs

Mercury concentrations in eggs were highest for Caspian terns, intermediate for California least terns, and lowest for cormorants and western gulls (Table 13). The most conservative screening level for mercury in eggs is 300 ng/g fw, which was exceeded by concentrations in eggs of Caspian terns only. The mean mercury concentration in Caspian tern eggs is between the NOAEC and a low-end LOAEC for avian species in general (600 ng/g fw). Concentrations in all of the Caspian tern eggs are well below a LOAEC (3,700 ng/g fw) for reproductive effects in common tern (Figure 22). Although a conservative screening level is exceeded by mercury concentrations in Caspian tern eggs, the likelihood of detecting mercury-related adverse reproductive effects in the field may be low.

Table 13. Mercury concentrations in seabird eggs collected from San Diego Bay nesting colonies, 2013

Species	Location	Mercury - Hg (ng/g fw)				
		Mean	SD	N	Min	Max
California least tern	Salt Works	156	52	3	108	211
California least tern	CVWR	158	40	4	112	209
California least tern	D Street	183	33	5*	130	206
California least tern	Lindbergh	224	39	5	176	270
Caspian tern	Salt Works	451	204	10	326	1,020
Double-crested cormorant	Salt Works	71	56	8	31	192
Western gull	NAS NI	61	37	8	18	126

* Data missing for one sample




Figure 22. Mercury concentrations (ng/g fw) in individual Caspian tern eggs collected from the South San Diego Bay Salt Works, 2013.

Dietary exposure to mercury

Both mean and maximum concentrations of mercury in aquatic biota exceeded initial dietary screening levels (5-25 ng/g ww) for all of the avian receptors considered in this assessment (Table E1). Hazard quotients estimated for mean receptor-specific EPCs and assuming bay-wide use by avian receptors (Table 14 and Table F1) appear to support observations of the initial screen. Hazard quotients derived for individual regions demonstrate no particular regional differences (Table G1).

Table 14. HQs for dietary exposure by avian species to mercury in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay, based on mean EPCs and assuming birds forage throughout the bay.

Representative species	HQ - NOAEL (lowest)	HQ - NOAEL (sensitive)	HQ - NOAEL (less sensitive)	HQ - LOAEL (most sensitive)	HQ - LOAEL (mid-range)
Least tern	6.0	3.4	1.1	2.4	0.13
Caspian tern	2.8	1.6	0.5	1.1	0.06
Cormorant	3.8	2.2	0.7	1.5	0.09
Scoter	5.4	3.1	1.0	2.2	0.12
Gull	3.5	2.0	0.7	1.4	0.08

HQs derived from TRVs for sensitive species are >1.0 for all four representative species. Comparisons between species suggest that the risk of adverse effects may be greatest for small piscivores and for waterfowl that forage on benthic invertebrates. Having NOAEL-based HQs >1.0 indicates that risks posed by mercury to avian receptors are of concern. HQs derived from LOAELs for most sensitive species are also >1.0, suggesting that avian receptors may experience adverse effects associated with mercury in their diet. However, HQs derived from a mid-range LOAEL, even those derived from maximum EPCs are all well below 1.0 (Tables F1 and G1) and therefore if there are adverse effects, they may be difficult to detect, especially under field conditions.

Seabirds such as terns are considered to be relatively insensitive to mercury toxicity (Shore et al. 2011), so that HQs derived from LOAELs for sensitive species probably overstate the risk to seabirds, and while some risk is indicated, the likelihood of observing detectable adverse effects in seabirds is low. The potential for adverse effects to occur in other more sensitive piscivorous species (e.g., egrets) was not characterized in this assessment, partly because marsh and intertidal habitats were not sampled. Results obtained with estimates for seabirds, combined with LOAELs for sensitive species, suggest that the potential for mercury to adversely affect more sensitive piscivorous species cannot be discounted.

As previously stated, HQs suggest that mercury poses some risk of adverse effects in waterfowl that forage on benthic invertebrates, and waterfowl are more sensitive to mercury toxicity than seabirds (Shore et al. 2011). However, it is noted that the TRVs for mercury are based on effects that occur from exposure during the breeding season, which the representative species (surf scoter) does not spend in San Diego Bay. For mercury, reproductive effects are most sensitive. Other effects such as impacts on growth and neurotoxicity may occur in birds exposed outside the breeding season to mercury at doses greater than those used as benchmarks in this assessment. The potential for adverse effects of mercury on benthic-feeding waterfowl cannot be completely ruled out.

Overall, LOAEL-based HQs >2.0 for surf scoter and for the least tern (a species of conservation concern), indicate that mercury in benthic invertebrates and forage fish poses some risk of adverse effects in those two representative species, and probably in other species that are more

sensitive than seabirds that use the bay. Consequently, mercury is considered to be an ongoing contaminant of concern, but the likelihood of observing detectable effects in the representative species is low. Ongoing monitoring, with some additional focus on risks to especially sensitive waterbird species and species that forage on benthic invertebrates is recommended.

DDTs

DDT Concentrations in seabird eggs are summarized below (Table 15), while details on dietary concentrations and HQs for adult avian receptors are provided in Tables F2 and G2.

DDT concentrations in eggs

Results of analyses for DDT and metabolites are presented as total DDTs. The metabolite, p,p'-DDE contributed more than 97 percent to total DDTs in all of the seabird egg samples. Total DDT concentrations (ng/g fw or ppb fw) were highest for Caspian tern and double-crested cormorant, intermediate for western Gull, and lowest (below all thresholds) for California least tern (Table 15).

Table 15. Total DDT concentrations (ng/g fw) in seabird eggs collected from San Diego Bay colonies, 2013.

Species	Location	Total DDTs (ng/g fw)				
		Mean	SD	N	Min	Max
California least tern	Salt Works	133	50	3	88	187
California least tern	CVWR	101	18	4	83	120
California least tern	D-Street Fill	66	31	6	43	127
California least tern	Lindbergh field	118	46	5	71	193
Caspian tern	Salt Works	1,478	866	10	511	2,766
Double-crested cormorant	Salt Works	1,276	1,096	8	294	3,644
Western gull	NAS NI	426	270	8	128	1,003

Although DDT concentrations in western gull eggs exceed the estimated NOAEC for eggshell thinning, they are below NOAECs and LOAECs for reduced productivity in both sensitive and less sensitive species (Figure 23).

Mean DDT concentrations in Caspian tern and double-crested cormorant eggs exceeded low-end screening levels for eggshell thinning and an estimated NOAEC of 1.0 µg/g fw for reduced productivity. The maximum DDT concentration observed in one double-crested cormorant egg exceeded a level associated with reduced productivity in brown pelican, an especially sensitive species. However, for the majority of samples, DDT concentrations in individual Caspian tern and double-crested cormorant eggs are below literature-based LOAECs for eggshell thinning and reduced productivity in "less sensitive" species (including cormorants and Caspian terns). Whether shells of Caspian tern or double-crested cormorant eggs collected for this study show signs of thinning is yet to be determined. Based on comparisons with literature-based values, exceedances of NOAECs may indicate some risk of DDT-related effects in Caspian terns and double-crested cormorants nesting at San Diego Bay, but the likelihood of actually detecting impacts may be low.




Figure 23. DDT concentrations (ng/g fw) in individual Caspian tern, double-crested cormorant and Western gull eggs collected from the San Diego Bay colonies, 2013.

Dietary exposure to DDTs

Both mean and maximum concentrations of DDT in some aquatic food web components exceeded initial dietary screening levels (11-21 ng/g ww) for two of the piscivorous avian receptors considered in this assessment (Table E2), and mostly for the small piscivore (least tern). For receptors other than the small piscivore evaluated here, screening level exceedances are by maximum concentrations only in a few (if any) of the aquatic biota samples (Tables E2-E7). Based on the initial screen, it appears that only small piscivores are at risk of potential adverse effects from exposure to DDTs in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay.

Hazard quotients estimated for mean receptor-specific EPCs, which factor in dietary preferences, and assuming bay-wide use by avian receptors (Table 16 and Table F1) indicate that small piscivores may be at greater risk of effects than the other receptor groups. However, they also

indicate that, with dietary preferences factored in to the exposure estimates, risks to even the small piscivores are below levels of concern (HQ<1.0; Table 16). Hazard quotients for the least tern might have been higher if results obtained with deepbody anchovy were included in EPC calculations for that representative species. However, presumably because of the body shape, deepbody anchovy is not a preferred prey species for the least tern (Atwood and Kelly 1984). Hazard quotients for DDTs may vary with the region in which the species are foraging, with highest occurring in the north where the HQ based on the mean EPC for least tern combined with the lowest NOAEL-based TRVs is 1.12 (Table G2). HQs computed from maximum EPCs are all less than 3.0 when based on the lowest NOAEL-based TRV, and like those computed from mean EPCs (Table 16), they are less than 1.0 when based on NOAELs for less sensitive species and LOAELs for most sensitive species.

Table 16. HQs for dietary exposure by avian species to DDTs in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay, based on mean EPCs and assuming birds forage throughout the bay.

Representative species	HQ - NOAEL (lowest)	HQ - NOAEL (less sensitive)	HQ - LOAEL (most sensitive)	HQ - LOAEL (mid-range)
Least tern	0.93	0.04	0.31	0.006
Caspian tern	0.32	0.01	0.11	0.002
Cormorant	0.43	0.02	0.14	0.003
Scoter	0.23	0.01	0.08	0.001
Gull	0.55	0.02	0.18	0.003

DDT concentrations in aquatic food web organisms from San Diego Bay may have exceeded the screening level based on the lowest NOAEL for one of the representative species, but overall the HQs that reflect the potential for adverse effects in adult birds exposed to DDT in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay are below levels of concern.

PCBs and PCB-TEQs

PCB and PCB-TEQ concentrations in seabird eggs are summarized below (Tables 17 and 18), while details on dietary concentrations and HQs for adult avian receptors are provided in Tables E3, E4, F3, F4, G3, and G4 with results summarized below.

PCB (total, PCB 126, and TEQ) concentrations in eggs

Based on concentration alone, PCBs are the primary contaminant of potential concern, followed by DDT, for California least tern and western gulls nesting at San Diego Bay colonies (Tables 15 and 17). For Caspian terns and double-crested cormorants, PCB concentrations are second only to DDTs. While maximum total PCB concentrations exceed a LOAEC of 1,000 ng/g fw for reproductive effects in highly sensitive species (chicken), they are below the estimated NOAEC for a sensitive reproductive effect in waterbirds (2,300 ng/g fw), and are well below the low-end

LOAEC of 23,000 ng/g fw for embryo lethality in gulls, terns and raptors (Table 8). Alone, total PCB concentrations in sampled eggs are below levels of concern for waterbirds. However, PCBs may act in combination with other similarly acting contaminants, most notably dioxins/furans (which were not analyzed in this study) and PBDEs. In some Caspian tern and double-crested cormorant eggs, the occurrence of dioxins/furans and/or PBDEs may raise the potential for PCB-related reproductive effects to a low level of concern, in which a no effect-based screening level may be exceeded but an actual measured effect level is not.

Table 17. Total PCB concentrations (ng/g fw) in seabird eggs collected from San Diego Bay colonies, 2013.

Species	Location	Total PCBs (ng/g fw)				
		Mean	SD	N	Min	Max
California least tern	Salt Works	296	81	3	205	361
California least tern	CVWR	316	90	4	260	431
California least tern	D-Street Fill	241	99	6	150	408
California least tern	Lindbergh field	384	277	5	232	877
Caspian tern	Salt Works	636	315	10	231	1,276
Double-crested cormorant	Salt Works	927	837	8	276	2,358
Western gull	NAS NI	599	273	8	370	1,072

Concentrations of the four PCB congeners with the greatest potency for dioxin-like toxicity (77, 81, 126 and 169) were generally below the limits of detection (<0.05 ng/g ww). PCB 77 was the most frequently detected. Out of 44 samples, PCB 77 was detected in 28 samples (0.41 - 3.23 ng/g fw), PCB 126 was detected in four (0.5 - 3.3 ng/g fw), PCB 81 was detected in two (0.64 and 0.84 ng/g fw), and PCB 169 was detected in only one (0.37 ng/g fw). Observed concentrations of PCB 126 may exceed a threshold for embryo lethality in highly sensitive species (1.1 ng/g fw), but are below the estimated NOAEC (7.2 ng/g fw) for embryo lethality in waterbirds.

Of the PCB congeners with sufficient potential to cause dioxin-like toxicity to assign a TEF, PCBs 118 and 156 were detected most frequently and at highest concentrations. Concentrations of these and ten other congeners with dioxin-like toxicity were factored into estimates of total dioxin-like PCB TEQs (Table 18). Mean TEQ concentrations may be greater than the screening value for enzyme induction (0.03 ng/g fw; (Harris and Elliott 2011), but are less than the threshold for embryo lethality (0.18 ng/g fw) in highly sensitive species. Based on comparisons with thresholds for highly sensitive species, TEQ concentrations in at least some individual seabird eggs may exceed levels of concern for embryo lethality (>0.18 ng/g fw). For species other than the most sensitive, TEQ concentrations in seabird eggs are below any thresholds associated with embryo lethality (Figure 24). As with total PCBs, in some small percentage of Caspian tern or double-crested cormorant eggs, the occurrence of dioxins/furans may raise the potential for dioxin-like reproductive effects to a low level of concern, in which a no effect-based screening level may be exceeded but an actual measured effect level is not.

Table 18. Dioxin-like PCB TEQs (ng/g fw) in seabird eggs collected from San Diego Bay colonies, 2013.

Species	Location	Dioxin-like PCB TEQ (ng/g fw)				
		Mean	SD	N	Min	Max
California least tern	Salt Works	0.104	0.152	3	<0.005	0.278
California least tern	CVWR	0.065	0.087	4	<0.005	0.193
California least tern	D Street fill	0.035	0.040	6	<0.005	0.107
California least tern	Lindbergh	0.035	0.039	5	<0.005	0.088
Caspian tern	Salt Works	0.100	0.103	10	0.001	0.331
Double-crested cormorant	Salt Works	0.037	0.032	8	0.001	0.082
Western gull	NAS NI	0.028	0.023	8	0.002	0.058




Figure 24. PCB-TEQ concentrations (ng/g fw) in individual California least tern and Caspian tern eggs collected from the San Diego Bay colonies, 2013.

Dietary exposure to PCBs (total, PCB 126, and TEQ)

Both mean and maximum concentrations of PCBs in some aquatic food web components (primarily fish) exceeded initial dietary screening levels for piscivorous avian receptors considered in this assessment (Table E3). Based on the initial screen, it appears that piscivorous seabirds are at risk of adverse effects from exposure to PCBs in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay.

Hazard quotients estimated for mean receptor-specific EPCs, which factor in dietary preferences, and assuming bay-wide use by avian receptors as summarized in Table 19, indicate that risks posed by dietary exposure to PCBs may be elevated (i.e., $HQ > 1.0$) for small piscivores (e.g., least tern), but are below levels of concern for other species. HQs based on maximum EPCs, combined with the NOAEL-based TRV for most sensitive species are > 1.0 for four of the five representative species (excepting scoter), with HQ values ranging from 1.4 to 3.9 (Table F3). The HQ for species like the least tern raises some concern about potential for adverse effects. However, the NOAEL-based TRV used for HQ estimates is for most sensitive species (chickens), and consequently the HQs, which are all < 2.0 for mean EPCs, and < 4.0 for maximum EPS likely overestimate the risks to species other than chickens and other terrestrial species in general (Harris and Elliott 2011).

As discussed in “methods” the PCB concentrations reported for aquatic biota may underestimate total PCB concentrations as determined by other methods that include more than the Bight '13 congeners. As such, total PCB concentrations in fish will be approximately 1.27 times the values used for HQ estimates. As a result, estimated HQs may be higher than shown by a factor of approximately 1.27. Adjusting the results has little effect on the conclusions of this assessment. The dietary exposure to total PCBs by one or more of the receptors may pose some risk of adverse effects, however, the likelihood of detecting actual effects associated with total PCB exposure, such as impaired growth, metabolism, reproduction and behavior, in field populations is very low.

Table 19. HQs for dietary exposure by avian species to PCBs (Bight '13 congeners) in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay, based on mean EPCs and assuming birds forage throughout the bay.

Representative species	HQ - NOAEL (lowest)	HQ - LOAEL (mid-range)
Least tern	1.73	0.12
Caspian tern	0.54	0.04
Cormorant	0.71	0.05
Scoter	0.31	0.02
Gull	0.92	0.07

Hazard quotients estimated for mean receptor-specific EPCs for the dioxin-like congeners only (TEQs) indicate that risks of dioxin-like effects are elevated for all of the representative species. HQs based on mean EPCs are as high as 11 (Table 20), and HQs based on maximum EPCs are as high as 84 (Table F4).

Table 20. HQs for dietary exposure by avian species to PCB TEQs in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay, based on mean EPCs and assuming birds forage throughout the bay.

Representative species	HQ - NOAEL (lowest)	HQ - LOAEL (most sensitive)	HQ - LOAEL (mid-range)
Least tern	11	0.24	0.07
Caspian tern	6	0.12	0.03
Cormorant	9	0.19	0.05
Scoter	2	0.04	0.01
Gull	11	0.24	0.07

Like total PCBs, the high HQs for PCB TEQs were derived using a NOAEL-based TRV for most sensitive species, and as such will overestimate risk to waterbirds. HQs obtained when using the LOAEL for most sensitive species are all well below 1.0. Consequently, for those species with the higher HQs (e.g., >5.0), there may be some risk of dioxin-like adverse effects from dietary exposure to PCBs in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay. However, the likelihood of actually detecting dioxin-like effects (e.g., lethality and teratogenic effects in offspring) in field populations is low at levels where the LOAEL-based TRV is not exceeded.

PBDEs

PBDE concentrations in seabird eggs are summarized below (Table 21). Details on dietary concentrations and HQs for adult avian receptors are provided in Tables F5 and G5, with results summarized below.

PBDE concentrations in eggs

Egg samples were analyzed for fifteen PBDE congeners. Of those, BDEs 47, 99 and 100 generally contributed more than 80 percent to total PBDE concentrations in the seabird egg samples. Based on mean concentration, Caspian terns are the most exposed to PBDEs, followed by Western gull, double-crested cormorants and California least terns (Table 21). Mean total PBDE concentrations are either below or slightly exceed (Caspian terns) an estimated NOAEC (200 ng/g fw) for reproductive effects. PBDE concentrations in some individual Caspian tern, double-crested cormorant and Western gull eggs are greater than the estimated NOAEC but well below the LOAEC for reduced hatching success in a sensitive species (1,800 ng/g fw). Absent data specific to seabirds, exceedances of an estimated NOAEC may indicate a potential for reduced hatching success. However, the likelihood of actually detecting PBDE-related reductions in hatching success, especially under field conditions, is probably low.

Table 21. Total PBDE concentrations (ng/g fw) in seabird eggs collected from San Diego Bay colonies, 2013.

Species	Location	Total PBDEs (ng/g fw)				
		Mean	SD	N	Min	Max
California least tern	Salt Works	76	22	3	61	102
California least tern	CVWR	57	18	4	38	77
California least tern	D-Street Fill	37	16	6	21	67
California least tern	Lindbergh field	39	11	5	30	52
Caspian tern	Salt Works	244	110	10	83	414
Double-crested cormorant	Salt Works	89	99	8	9	280
Western gull	NAS NI	176	96	8	53	304

Dietary exposure to PBDEs

Conservative dietary screening levels for PBDEs were only occasionally exceeded by concentrations in a few species of forage fish and benthic crustaceans (Table E5). Hazard quotients estimated for mean receptor-specific EPCs, which factor in dietary preferences, and assuming bay-wide use by avian receptors are below 1.0 (Table 22). HQs calculated from maximum EPCs, combined with the NOAEL-based TRV range from 0.4 for Caspian tern to 3.3 for Scoter (Tables F5 and G5). All HQs computed with the LOAEL-based TRV are well below 1.0. Consequently, risks associated with dietary exposure to PBDEs by seabirds and waterfowl that forage in San Diego Bay are considered to be of limited concern.

Table 22. HQs for dietary exposure by avian species to PBDEs in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay, based on mean EPCs and assuming birds forage throughout the bay.

Representative species	HQ - NOAEL (lowest)	HQ - LOAEL (most sensitive)
Least tern	0.45	0.045
Caspian tern	0.074	0.007
Cormorant	0.090	0.009
Scoter	0.208	0.021
Gull	0.115	0.012

PFCs

Samples of aquatic biota were not analyzed for PFCs, so that the assessment of risks posed by PFCs to seabirds is based on concentrations in eggs only.

PFC concentrations in eggs

Only tern eggs were analyzed for PFCs, and results are reported as the sum of the concentrations of the six PFCs targeted for this study (Table 23). Of the six PFCs, PFOS was detected most frequently and at concentrations that constituted more than 90 percent of the total. Total PFCs reported in Table 23 are essentially PFOS concentrations. Concentrations in all of the egg samples are well below the estimated NOAEC for reduced hatchability (1,000 ng/g fw) and therefore are below levels of concern.

Table 23. Total PFC concentrations in California least tern and Caspian tern eggs collected from San Diego Bay colonies, 2013.

Species	Location	Total PFCs (ng/g fw)				
		Mean	SD	N	Min	Max
California least tern	Salt Works	18.2	6.77	3	13.8	26.0
California least tern	CVWR	38.0	24.2	4	16.8	72.5
California least tern	D-Street Fill	30.9	24.1	6	4.50	66.3
California least tern	Lindbergh field	14.7	6.39	5	9.35	25.8
Caspian tern	Salt Works	28.5	17.7	10	7.54	63.2

Chlordanes

Chlordane concentrations in seabird eggs are summarized below (Table 24). Concentrations measured in aquatic biota are summarized in Table E6. Because concentrations were all below the initial screening level, risks associated with dietary exposure to chlordanes were not considered further (i.e., no HQs were calculated).

Chlordane concentrations in eggs

Compared with other organic contaminants considered in this study, total chlordane concentrations in San Diego Bay seabird eggs are low (Table 24). Unfortunately, absent literature on effect levels in eggs, it is not possible to determine if the observed chlordane concentrations in San Diego Bay seabird eggs are sufficient to cause adverse effects.

Table 24. Total chlordane concentrations in seabird eggs collected from San Diego Bay colonies, 2013.

Species	Location	Total Chlordanes (ng/g fw)				
		Mean	SD	N	Min	Max
California least tern	Salt Works	8.86	7.64	3	3.06	17.51
California least tern	CVWR	6.03	1.82	4	4.12	8.36
California least tern	D-Street Fill	3.50	1.86	6	2.04	7.08
California least tern	Lindbergh field	6.01	1.64	5	4.50	8.27
Caspian tern	Salt Works	9.53	6.58	10	2.14	24.6
Double-crested cormorant	Salt Works	1.37	1.44	8	0.04	3.49
Western gull	NAS NI	1.68	1.54	8	0.14	4.08

Dietary exposure to chlordane

Based on the initial screen, concentrations of chlordane in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay are considered to be below levels of concern for seabirds and waterfowl that forage in the bay. It should be noted, however that there is only one study from which a dietary screening level could be derived, and therefore the NOAEL-based screening level thus derived should be used with caution. That said, maximum concentrations of chlordane in aquatic biota ranged from <0.05 to 10 ng/g ww, all of which are more than an order of magnitude lower than the dietary screening levels identified for avian receptors (196 - 1,006 ng/g ww; Table E6) and used here for seabird and waterfowl species. Consequently, based on the available information, it appears that chlordane concentrations in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay are below levels of concern.

PAHs

Samples of seabird eggs were not analyzed for PAHs, so that the assessment of risks posed by PAHs to seabirds is based on dietary exposure only. In addition, LPAHs and HPAHs were evaluated separately to address differences in physical/chemical properties that influence fate and toxicity. Concentrations of LPAHs and HPAHs measured in aquatic biota are summarized in Table E7. Concentrations of LPAHs in all samples were below the initial screening levels, so LPAHs were not considered further (i.e., no HQs were estimated for LPAHs). Concentrations of HPAHs in benthic invertebrates did exceed screening levels (Table E7), and therefore are evaluated in greater detail below. Details on dietary concentrations of HPAHs and corresponding HQs for adult avian receptors are provided in Tables F6 and G6, with results summarized below.

Dietary exposure to HPAHs

Hazard quotients estimated for mean receptor-specific EPCs, which factor in dietary preferences, and assuming bay-wide use by avian receptors are below 1.0 for piscivorous (feed on fish) birds, but approaches a value of 8.0 for waterfowl that forage on benthic invertebrates (Scoter; Table 25). HQs based on maximum EPCs are also below 1.0 for piscivores, but ~270 for species that forage on benthic invertebrates (Tables F6 and G6).

The highest NOAEL-based HQs for benthic foraging waterbirds exposed to HPAHs occur in the northern region of the bay, where the maximum HQ is ~270 and the mean is ~19 (Table G6). In the central and southern regions of the bay, maximum HQs are <3.5 and mean HQs are <1.0 (Table G6). HQs derived for HPAHs using the NOAEL-based TRV indicate that avian species that forage on benthic biota in the northern part of San Diego Bay are at elevated risk of adverse effects from dietary exposure to HPAHs.

Table 25. HQs for dietary exposure by avian species to HPAHs in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay, based on mean EPCs and assuming birds forage throughout the bay.

Representative species	HQ - NOAEL (sensitive)	HQ - LOAEL (most sensitive)
Least tern	0.34	0.003
Caspian tern	0.07	0.001
Cormorant	0.06	0.001
Scoter	7.74	0.077
Gull	0.29	0.003

However, HQs obtained for benthic feeding birds using the LOAEL-based TRV are <1.0 (for mean EPCs; bay wide or by region) and <3.5 (for maximum EPCs; baywide and by region) (Tables F6 and G6).

The TRVs for HPAHs are based on reproductive effects from exposure during the breeding season, while doses higher than the selected TRVs are associated with effects that may result from exposure outside the breeding season, such as reduced growth and impaired immune function (e.g., see Appendix D). Because surf scoters are not present during the breeding season, the elevated HQs obtained with HPAHs likely overestimate risks to that species. Avian species that forage on benthic invertebrates and are present during their breeding season may experience adverse reproductive effects from dietary exposure to HPAHs in the northern region of the bay. However, the low HQs derived from LOAEL-based TRVs suggest that the likelihood of actually detecting HPAH-related impacts in benthic foraging waterfowl in the field is low.

UNCERTAINTY EVALUATION

Uncertainties inherent in study design, data analysis and assessment protocols are identified throughout the body of this report. An awareness of uncertainties, especially those that may most affect assessment results allow risk managers to be better informed when evaluating the risk assessment conclusions. Uncertainties and some limitations of this assessment are summarized below.

Conceptual site model

The conceptual model for this assessment reflects a focus on potential worst case exposure of wildlife to specific bioaccumulative contaminants in San Diego Bay. Given the contaminants of interest, the focus is on upper trophic level avian predators of aquatic food web biota, primarily fish and benthic invertebrates, in San Diego Bay. Potential risks to herbivores or to marine mammals were not evaluated, due to lack of data (herbivores), or limited exposure and lower sensitivity than indicated for birds (mammals). However, the selected avian receptors are expected to experience greater levels of exposure (and risk) to the contaminants of interest than are herbivores or marine mammals.

Sampling and analyses were confined to shallow and mid-depth subtidal habitats. Consequently, risks posed by contaminants in San Diego Bay to wildlife that forage in intertidal or marsh habitats were not addressed in this assessment.

Exposure via dermal contact or inhalation pathways were not evaluated in this assessment, partly because methods are unavailable, but also because the greatest amount of exposure is expected to be via ingestion of food and, to a lesser extent, incidental ingestion of sediment. While there may be some uncertainty about exposure via dermal contact or inhalation, incorporating estimates of exposure via those routes would be difficult to make and likely have no effect on the outcome of the assessment.

Data, Contaminants of Potential Concern, and Exposure Point Concentrations

Seabird egg samples were collected in 2013 and food web samples were collected in 2013/2014. Both sets of samples provide data that are current, have sufficient numbers for statistical analyses, and food web samples include taxa that are major constituents of the diets of wildlife species that forage in shallow and mid-depth subtidal habitats of San Diego Bay. There are some uncertainties that may result in over- or underestimates of risk.

Eggs of terns and cormorants were failed-to-hatch, and as such data on those eggs may reflect higher contaminant loads than would be observed with randomly selected fresh laid eggs (risks may be overestimated).

Data on contaminant levels in food web organisms are considered to be representative of contaminant levels in the diets of avian wildlife foraging in San Diego Bay during the summers of 2013 and 2014. Diet composition of avian species may vary with season for both intrinsic and extrinsic reasons, and contaminant levels in aquatic biota may vary with season. Consequently, there is some uncertainty about potential seasonal or inter-annual variations in contaminant levels in the diets of avian receptors that may or may not be captured by the available data. This uncertainty is mitigated somewhat by the use of average and maximum exposure point concentrations and multiple screening levels and TRVs for bracketing risks. In addition, data are provided for a variety of aquatic species, which would allow for consideration, if desired, of changes in diet composition of receptor species.

A stratified random sampling design was used to select sample sites, which appear to have captured few if any of the most contaminated sediment sites. Whether areas with higher levels of contamination in sediment and resident benthic biota are sufficiently represented contributes to uncertainty about estimated contaminant levels in the diets of ecological receptors (e.g., surf scoter) that rely on benthic organisms for food. Both average and maximum concentrations obtained from the available data help to bracket the potential range of dietary contaminant levels and associated risks to wildlife that forage on benthic invertebrates, but risk may be underestimated by estimated averages.

Sampling and analyses for this assessment were focused on contaminants previously selected by the San Diego RWQCB, based on concerns for aquatic-dependent wildlife and humans that consume aquatic biota from San Diego Bay. This assessment evaluated wildlife risks posed by mercury, DDTs, chlordanes, PCBs, PBDEs, PFCs and PAHs in avian eggs and/or food web organisms. Risks posed to wildlife by other potential COPCs such as metals other than mercury,

metalloids, dioxins/furans, and newer use pesticides were not evaluated, and as such may be underestimated.

Total PCB concentrations are reported as the sums of the 41 Bight '13 congeners and as such underestimate total PCB concentrations (quantified using sums of more than 60 congeners or the Aroclor standard approach), the latter of which are the basis of historic data and reference values. Reported PCB concentrations in seabird eggs were adjusted for this uncertainty, while concentrations reported for aquatic biota were not. Estimated exposure point concentrations for PCBs in aquatic biota result in underestimates of dietary exposure and subsequent risks posed by total PCBs to avian receptors. For receptors that consume forage fish the difference appears to be a factor of ~1.27.

Concentrations of mixtures were computed as the sums of the concentrations of the individual constituents. The highest reported constituent detection limit was substituted for the sum when all constituents were “non-detects.” This is a conservative approach that results in an estimated concentration of the mixture that may be biased high and result in an overestimate of exposure to contaminants that occur as mixtures.

Dietary exposure point concentrations were computed from summary data, which included mean, range, N, and the standard deviation for contaminant concentrations by taxon (species of fish or order of benthic invertebrates). Exposure point concentrations were computed for combinations of taxa, to reflect the dietary composition for each of the receptor categories. While it was possible to compute weighted averages, confidence limits could not be computed within the time allotted. Consequently, weighted averages and maximum values were used to represent dietary exposure point concentrations. Average concentrations are considered to be representative of contaminant levels in diets of avian receptors that forage on multiple species over areas that may encompass the entire bay, or even regions of the bay. Uncertainty about how well the average EPC represents average concentrations in receptor diets is addressed in part by considering maximum concentrations as well. Dietary exposure by avian receptors to contaminants in aquatic biota may be over- or underestimated by average concentrations, and may be overestimated by maximum concentrations. The use of maximum values increases the overall uncertainty associated with estimates of constituent intake, but makes it unlikely that exposures are underestimated.

As indicated previously, exposure point concentrations were computed from data on contaminant levels in combinations of taxa that were collected to reflect the dietary composition for each of the receptor categories. It is likely that species collected for this study did not include all that may be consumed by a particular receptor. While major dietary components appear to be represented by samples, the lack of data on other commonly consumed biota (e.g., squid consumed by gulls, and grunion consumed by Caspian terns), may result in an over- or underestimation of dietary exposure point concentrations and risk to certain receptors.

Exposure Assessment

Contaminants measured in seabird eggs are assumed to be derived, via the female parent, from aquatic biota in San Diego Bay. Contaminant levels in seabird eggs are expected to reflect levels in the diet of the female parent while present at the nesting site, but some of the parental diet may be from outside San Diego Bay. Contaminant levels measured in seabird eggs may overestimate

exposure and risks posed by contaminants in San Diego Bay proper. This uncertainty is species-specific, as some avian species are expected to obtain most if not all of their food during nesting season from San Diego Bay whereas others are not (refer to species profiles for additional information).

Dietary exposure by avian receptors to contaminants was assumed to be primarily, if not entirely from San Diego Bay, depending on the species. Assumptions about foraging behavior and feeding preferences were obtained from literature, which in some cases applied to San Diego Bay, but was generally for birds at other locations. In addition, other factors used to compute daily dose rates (e.g., body weight, food ingestion rates) are based on literature values for the same or similar species at other locations. Site-specific information was used when available. However, uncertainty about site-specific exposure factors may result in either over- or underestimation of risk specific to San Diego Bay.

Screening levels and TRVs (Toxicity Assessment)

Uncertainty is inherent in the toxicity values selected for evaluating risk. Screening levels for assessing contaminant levels in eggs and TRVs for evaluating daily dietary dose rates by adults were obtained from the literature on effect levels, which ranges from extensive for some contaminants (e.g., PCBs, DDT and mercury) to one or a few studies (e.g., PAHs, PFCs, chlordane, and PBDEs). Even with a robust data base, there are major sources of uncertainty about toxicity values. Two basic types of uncertainty relate to species differences in sensitivity and to laboratory versus field-based data. In general, the literature-based screening levels and dietary effect levels are for species other than those considered in this assessment, resulting in uncertainty about species differences in sensitivity. Identification of effect levels in eggs is typically field-based for which the presence of other contaminants is at least one complicating factor. Screening levels based on field-collected data may over- or underestimate risk, depending on interactions between co-occurring contaminants, or complications from extrinsic factors. Dietary effect levels are most often obtained from lab-based studies, but may be field-based as well. There are uncertainties about using lab-based effect levels (TRVs) to assess exposure under natural conditions, where for example uptake of the contaminant in question may be lower than occurs in the lab. Effect levels observed in lab-based studies may be from less than chronic exposures and/or dose-response relationships are not as clear as desired (e.g., effects observed at the lowest dose rate used). Depending on the data, lab-based TRVs may result in either over- or underestimates of risk from dietary exposure to a particular contaminant in the field.

Multiple toxicity values were identified for contaminants with sufficient data. The lowest toxicity values for avian eggs and TRVs were derived using conservative protocols, most notably by: focusing on sensitive effects relating to survival, growth and reproduction; working from lowest of reported effect levels; and, applying uncertainty factors when necessary for species differences in sensitivity (eggs and TRVs), lack of adequate dose-response data (eggs and TRVs), and/or exposure duration of the benchmark study (TRVs). The lowest selected toxicity values (NOAECs and NOAELs) are intended to represent values that are credible, but will overestimate risk of adverse effects. For some contaminants, most notably PCBs, the conservativeness of the lowest toxicity values used to assess risks to aquatic-dependent avian species is well established. However, toxicity values selected for contaminants with a very limited data base are used with caution and their use may over or underestimate risk.

Risk Characterization

Risk characterization using HQs allows for assessment of potential cumulative risks from exposure to multiple contaminants that exert effects through the same mode of action (e.g., PCBs, dioxins/furans and PBDEs). Samples were not analyzed for dioxins/furans and potential cumulative risks were not addressed in this assessment. Conclusions based on HQs for PCBs and PBDEs, individually may underestimate overall risks of dioxin-like effects in exposed birds.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report presents a review of contaminant levels measured in seabird eggs collected in 2013 from nesting colonies around San Diego Bay, and in aquatic food web organisms collected from San Diego Bay in 2013 and 2014. The seabird eggs were collected as part of a larger investigation to assess exposure and potential risks posed to wildlife by contaminants in San Diego Bay, with a focus on avian species that are top predators in the aquatic food web, and as such are potentially the most heavily exposed to bioaccumulative contaminants. Several types of aquatic biota were collected as part of multiple investigations to characterize bioaccumulation and trophic interactions of contaminants in the aquatic-based food web of San Diego Bay. Data on contaminant levels in aquatic biota and avian eggs were used to evaluate exposure and risks associated with dietary exposure to contaminants, and for avian receptors, risk associated with *in ovo* exposure by embryos to contaminants transferred from the female parent to the egg. Risks to five types of waterbirds, representing different feeding preferences and strategies were evaluated.

Based on previously expressed concerns by the SDRWQCB, this assessment was focused on specific bioaccumulative contaminants, those being mercury, OC pesticides (DDT and chlordanes), PCBs, PBDEs, PFCs and PAHs. Concentrations of contaminants detected in eggs were compared with literature-based values used to define thresholds associated with adverse effects in directly exposed embryos of avian species. Screening values included at least one NOAEC, above which potential risk requires further consideration, and one or more LOAECs to characterize potential for detecting contaminant-related impacts. For dietary exposure to adult birds, data on contaminant levels in aquatic biota were used to estimate species- and site-specific daily dose (exposure) rates. Daily doses were then compared with literature-based values used to define thresholds for adverse effects associated with dietary exposure to contaminants. Reference values included at least one no effect-based daily dose rate (NOAEL), above which potential risk requires further consideration, and one or more low observed effect-based daily dose rate (LOAEL) to characterize potential for detecting contaminant-related impacts.

Results are summarized as follows:

Mercury

- Mercury concentrations in at least some seabird eggs are greater than the estimated NOAEC, but below LOAECs.
- Estimates of dietary exposure by adult birds to mercury exceed NOAELs and LOAELs for most sensitive species, but are below a NOAEL for less sensitive species, which include waterbirds.

- Mercury concentrations in seabird eggs are considered to be present at levels of potential concern but the likelihood of detecting measurable effects is low.
- Mercury in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay may pose some risk of adverse effects on avian species that forage on benthic invertebrates and on small-bodied avian species that forage on pelagic fish. The likelihood of detecting measurable effects is low, but may be greater for more sensitive species. Ongoing monitoring, with additional focus on risks to especially sensitive waterbird species, and species that forage on benthic invertebrates is recommended.

DDTs

- Total DDTs concentrations in at least some seabird eggs are greater than estimated NOAECs for eggshell thinning and reduced nest productivity. They also exceed LOAECs for a highly sensitive species, but are below LOAECs for less sensitive species that include terns and cormorants.
- Estimates of dietary exposure of adult birds to DDTs in aquatic food web organisms from San Diego Bay are below NOAELs, and therefore below levels of concern.

PCBs

- Total PCBs and TCDD-TEQ concentrations in at least some seabird eggs exceed LOAECs for highly sensitive species, but are below estimated NOAECs for less sensitive species, which include waterbirds. The potential for similarly-acting contaminants to increase risk still requires further consideration.
- Estimates of dietary exposure by one of the receptor species to total PCBs are greater than a NOAEL for most sensitive species. The estimated daily exposures to PCBs as TEQs for all receptors were greater than a NOAEL for most sensitive species, but less than a LOAEL, also for most sensitive species. Risks associated with dietary exposure to PCBs (as total PCBs or TEQs) may be overestimated, but are still of concern.

PBDEs

- Total PBDE concentrations in at least some seabird eggs are greater than the estimated NOAEC, but are below the LOAEC.
- Estimated daily dietary exposure by waterfowl and seabirds to PBDEs in aquatic are below NOAELs.

PFCs

- Concentrations of PFCs (primarily PFOS) in seabird eggs are well below the only readily available NOAEC.
- Aquatic biota were not analyzed for PFCs. Consequently, risks associated with dietary exposure to PFCs were not assessed.

Chlordane

- Due to lack of data on effect levels, concentrations of chlordanes in seabird eggs could not be evaluated for potential effects.
- Estimated daily dietary exposure by waterfowl and seabirds to chlordanes in aquatic biota are below the single available NOAEL.

PAHs

- Seabird eggs were not analyzed for PAHs, so potential risks posed by PAHs to developing embryos were not assessed.
- Estimated daily dietary exposure the LPAHs by waterfowl and seabirds that forage on aquatic biota from San Diego Bay are below the NOAEL.
- Estimated daily dietary exposure to HPAHs by waterfowl that forage on benthic invertebrates are greater than the NOAEL, but less than the LOAEL. Avian species that forage on benthic invertebrates, especially if present during the breeding season may be at risk of adverse effects from exposure to HPAHs.

RISK TO HUMAN HEALTH

DATA ANALYSIS

Comparison to OEHHA guidelines

Tissue contaminant concentrations were compared to Advisory Tissue Levels (ATLs) and Fish Contaminant Goals (FCGs) established by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). These guidelines provide recommendations for the frequency of fish consumption and take into consideration the health benefits of a diet that includes fish (Table 26). The average tissue concentration for each species, either by region or for the entire bay, was compared to the ATLs or FCGs for each contaminant type.

Table 26. Fish Contaminant Goals (FCGs) and Advisory Tissue Levels (ATLs) based on an assessment of human health risk by OEHHA (Klasing and Brodberg, 2008). All values given in ng/g (ppb) wet weight. One serving is defined as 8 ounces (227 g) prior to cooking.

Contaminant	FCG	ATL for 8 oz Serving Size (ng/g)			
		3 servings per week	2 servings per week	1 serving per week	No Consumption
Chlordanes (ng/g)	5.6	≤ 190	> 190-280	> 280-560	> 560
DDTs (ng/g)	21	≤ 520	> 520-1000	> 1000-2100	> 2100
Dieldrin (ng/g)	0.46	≤ 15	> 15-23	> 23-46	> 46
Mercury ¹ (ng/g)	220	≤ 70	> 70-150	> 150-440	> 440
Mercury ² (ng/g)	655	≤ 220	> 220-440	> 440-1310	> 1310
PCBs (ng/g)	3.6	≤ 21	> 21-42	> 42-120	> 120

¹ Women 18 to 45 years of age and children 1 to 17 years of age

² Women over 45 years of age and men

Tissue contamination

Contaminant analyses were conducted on 23 samples of sport fish from San Diego Bay that represented 5 commonly consumed species. Every sample contained detectable levels of mercury and PCBs (Table 27). DDTs were detected in all species, except for round stingray. Dieldrin was not detected in any of the samples. Chlordanes were usually in Pacific chub mackerel and spotted sand bass.

Species-specific variations in contaminant concentration were apparent for some chemicals. Average concentrations of PCBs, DDTs and chlordanes were higher in Pacific chub mackerel than other species. Concentrations of mercury varied little among species.

Table 27. Average chemical concentrations and standard deviations (SD) for sport fish collected in San Diego Bay (whole bay). N = number of samples used to calculate the average. N below Detection = number of samples below method detection limits. NA = data not available due to small sample size.

Analyte	Species	N	N Below Detection	Average	SD	Units
Chlordanes	California halibut	8	7	0.05	0.00	ng/g ww
Chlordanes	Pacific chub mackerel	3	0	1.12	0.89	ng/g ww
Chlordanes	Round stingray	2	1	0.11	0.09	ng/g ww
Chlordanes	Spotted sand bass	10	2	0.16	0.11	ng/g ww
Chlordanes	Topsmelt	1	0	0.34	NA	ng/g ww
DDTs	California halibut	8	0	1.27	0.76	ng/g ww
DDTs	Pacific chub mackerel	3	0	10.34	6.99	ng/g ww
DDTs	Round stingray	2	2	0.05	NA	ng/g ww
DDTs	Spotted sand bass	10	0	1.49	1.94	ng/g ww
DDTs	Topsmelt	1	0	3.03	NA	ng/g ww
Dieldrin	California halibut	8	8	0.05	NA	ng/g ww
Dieldrin	Pacific chub mackerel	3	3	0.05	NA	ng/g ww
Dieldrin	Round stingray	2	2	0.05	NA	ng/g ww
Dieldrin	Spotted sand bass	10	10	0.05	NA	ng/g ww
Dieldrin	Topsmelt	1	1	0.05	NA	ng/g ww
Mercury	California halibut	8	0	144.22	69.74	ng/g ww
Mercury	Pacific chub mackerel	3	0	114.05	87.47	ng/g ww
Mercury	Round stingray	2	0	209.45	31.98	ng/g ww
Mercury	Spotted sand bass	10	0	192.24	31.73	ng/g ww
Mercury	Topsmelt	1	0	29.73	NA	ng/g ww
PCBs	California halibut	8	0	14.62	8.89	ng/g ww
PCBs	Pacific chub mackerel	3	0	104	90.74	ng/g ww
PCBs	Round stingray	2	0	22.24	20.07	ng/g ww
PCBs	Spotted sand bass	10	0	29.36	11.72	ng/g ww
PCBs	Topsmelt	1	0	34.67	NA	ng/g ww

Multiple samples from more than one region of the Bay were available only for spotted sand bass and California halibut. Thus, spatial variation in tissue contamination was not examined for Pacific chub mackerel, round stingray, or topsmelt.

Tissue contaminant concentrations were generally qualitatively similar among the North, Central, and South regions of the Bay (Table 28). The greatest regional variation was observed for PCBs in spotted sand bass, where concentrations in fish from the North and Central were 2-3x greater than the South. Mercury concentrations showed less than a 2x variation among regions. The North region of the Bay also tended to have higher concentrations of tissue DDTs, with approximately a 2x increase relative to the Central and South. Spotted sand bass also tended to have higher chlordanes in the North.

Table 28. Average chlordanes, DDTs, dieldrin, mercury and PCBs concentrations and standard deviations (SD) for sport fish collected in three different regions of San Diego Bay. N = number of samples used to calculate the average. NA = data not available.

Species	North			Central			South		
	N	Average	SD	N	Average	SD	N	Average ²	SD
Chlordanes (ng/g ww)									
California halibut	2	0.04	0.01	5	0.05	0	1	0.05	NA
Pacific chub mackerel	2	0.67	0.63				1	2.01	NA
Round stingray	2	0.11	0.09						
Spotted sand bass	5	0.21	0.14	3	0.09	0.07	2	0.13	0.07
Topsmelt							1	0.34	NA
DDTs (ng/g ww)									
California halibut	2	2.05	1.18	5	1.03	0.52	1	0.93	NA
Pacific chub mackerel	2	6.65	4				1	17.73	NA
Round stingray	2	0.05	0						
Spotted sand bass	5	2.33	2.57	3	0.59	0.21	2	0.74	0.35
Topsmelt							1	3.03	NA
Dieldrin ¹ (ng/g ww)									
California halibut	2	0.05	0	5	0.05	0	1	0.05	NA
Pacific chub mackerel	2	0.05	0				1	0.05	NA
Round stingray	2	0.05	0						
Spotted sand bass	5	0.05	0	3	0.05	0	2	0.05	0
Topsmelt							1	0.05	NA
Mercury (ng/g ww)									
California halibut	2	81.70	18.91	5	168.66	75.63	1	147.04	NA
Pacific chub mackerel	2	64.03	17.15				1	214.07	NA
Round stingray	2	209.45	31.98						
Spotted sand bass	5	212.79	23.19	3	180.71	28.85	2	158.17	20.29
Topsmelt							1	29.73	NA
PCBs (ng/g ww)									
California halibut	2	18.17	20.92	5	13.23	4.51	1	14.44	NA
Pacific chub mackerel	2	54.93	44.99				1	202.13	NA
Round stingray	2	22.24	20.07						
Spotted sand bass	5	31.55	7.07	3	36.6	10.4	2	13.06	10.38
Topsmelt							1	34.67	NA

¹ All dieldrin values were below detection limits.

² When N = 1, value in field represents a single measurement.

SPORT FISH CONSUMPTION RISK

The average tissue contaminant concentrations of chlordanes, dieldrin, DDTs, and mercury were all below OEHHA fish contaminant goal (FCG) thresholds (Figures 25, 26, and 27). Tissue contaminant concentrations below the FCG indicate that consumption of one eight-ounce meal per week over a lifetime is not expected to result in more than one additional case of cancer per one million and no significant noncancer risk (Klasing and Brodberg 2008). Mercury concentrations in most fish species were very close to the FCG. However, for the sensitive population (women 18-45 years of age and children 1-17 years of age), all average tissue mercury concentrations in California halibut, round stingray, Pacific chub mackerel, spotted sand bass, and topsmelt exceeded OEHHA Advisory Tissue Levels for reduced consumption. The greatest consumption risk was indicated for spotted sand bass, where consumption of no more than one serving per week was indicated for all regions of the Bay (>150-440 ng/g ww, Table 26).

Tissue PCBs were above the FCG for all species analyzed (Figure 26). In addition, all species had average PCBs concentrations that exceeded one or more OEHHA ATLs. The single composite sample of Pacific chub mackerel from the South exceeded the ATL for no consumption, while average PCBs in mackerel from the North were in the ATL range corresponding to consumption of no more than one serving per week (Table 28). Spotted sand bass from the North and Central regions and round stingray from the North had average PCBs within the ATL range corresponding to no more than two servings per week. California halibut from all regions and spotted sand bass from the South had the lowest concentrations of PCBs and were in the ATL range corresponding to three servings per week.






Figure 25. Average total chlordanes and dieldrin concentrations (+ standard deviation) for San Diego Bay sport fish. Dashed line represents OEHHA Fish Contaminant Goal (FCG). NA = samples were not available for the species in the region. Samples with no error bars have an N of 1 or were below detection limit for all samples. All dieldrin concentrations were below the detection limit of 0.05 ng/g ww. The detection limit for chlordanes was 0.05 ng/g ww.

DDTs



PCBs




Figure 26. Average total DDTs concentrations (+ standard deviation) for San Diego Bay sport fish. Dashed line represents OEHHA Fish Contaminant Goal (FCG). The solid lines represent the OEHHA PCB ATLS corresponding to one, two, or three meals per week. NA = samples were not available for the species in the region. DDTs detection limit is 0.05 ng/g ww. PCBs detection limit is 0.05 ng/g ww. Samples with no error bars have an N of 1.

Mercury




Figure 27. Average mercury concentrations (+ standard deviation) for San Diego Bay sport fish. Dashed line represents OEHHA Fish Contaminant Goal (FCG) for mercury for women 18 to 45 years and children 1 to 17 years of age. The solid lines represent the OEHHA mercury ATLs corresponding to one, two, or three meals per week for women 18 to 45 years and children 1 to 17 years of age. NA = samples were not available for the species in the region. Mercury detection limit is 0.01 ng/g ww. Samples with no error bars have an N of 1.

HEALTH RISK SUMMARY

This study was successful in obtaining updated tissue contamination data for several species of sport fish commonly captured from San Diego Bay and consumed: California halibut, spotted sand bass, round stingray, Pacific chub mackerel, and topsmelt. Key findings from the data analyses are summarized below.

- PCBs are the dominant trace organic contaminant of fish in the Bay. DDTs, while still prevalent in fish, are usually present at much lower concentrations. Pacific chub mackerel and spotted sand bass tended to have the highest concentrations, among the species analyzed.
- There was little variation in tissue contaminant concentrations among the North, Central and South regions of the Bay. Within the same species, average contaminant concentrations usually varied by less than a factor of 3 among regions, with the North and Central regions containing the more highly contaminated fish.
- The greatest potential risk to human health appears to be associated with PCBs in fish tissue, followed closely by mercury. For both contaminants, tissue concentrations in multiple species of fish exceeded ATLS, and were within the range where consumption of no more than one meal per week is recommended by OEHHA.

REFERENCES

- Ainley, D.G., D.W. Anderson and P.R. Kelly. 1981. Feeding ecology of marine cormorants in southwestern North America. *The Condor*. 83(2):120-131
- Allen, L.G., A.M. Findlay and C.M. Phalen. 2002. Structure and standing stock of fish assemblages of San Diego Bay, California from 1994 to 1999. *Bull. Southern California Acad. Sci.* 101(2):49-85.
- Anderson, C.D., D.D. Roby and K. Collis. 2004. Foraging patterns of male and female double crested cormorants nesting in the Columbia River. *Can. J. Zool.* 82:541-554.
- Anderson, E.M., R.D. Dickson, E.K. Lok, E.C. Palm, J-P.L. Savard, D. Bordage and A. Reed. 2015. Surf Scoter (*Melanitta perspicillata*), *The Birds of North America Online* (A. Poole, Ed.). Ithaca: Cornell Lab of Ornithology; Retrieved from the Birds of North America Online: <http://bna.birds.cornell.edu/bna/species/363>.
- Atwood, J.L. and D.E. Minsky. 1983. Least tern foraging ecology at three major California breeding colonies. *Western Birds*. 14(2):57-72.
- Atwood, J.L. and P.R. Kelly. 1984. Fish dropped on breeding colonies as indicators of least tern food habits. *Wilson Bull.* 96(1):34-47
- Baird, P. 2010. Foraging study of California Least Terns in San Diego Bay and Near Ocean Waters, San Diego, California. Unpublished Rept. U.S. NAVFACENGCOM, San Diego
- Balz, D.M., G.V. Morejohn and B.S. Antrim. 1979. Size selective predation and food habits of two California terns. *Western Birds*. 10:17-24
- Bender, K. 1974. California least tern census and nesting survey. 1973. California Department of Fish and Game, Spec. Wildl. Investigations, Project no. W-54-R-6, Prog Report, Job II-11. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Sacramento CA. 7 pp + app.
- Beyer, W.N., M.C. Perry and P.C. Osenton. 2008. Sediment ingestion rates in waterfowl (Anatidae) and their use in environmental risk assessment. *Integr. Environ. Asses. Manage.* 4(2):246-251.
- Blus, L.J. 2011. DDT, DDD and DDD in birds. In "Second Edition, Environmental Contaminants in Biota, Interpreting Tissue Concentrations." W. N. Beyer and J.P. Meador, eds. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida. pp. 425-444.
- Burkhard, L.P., P.M. Cook, D.J. Hoff, and M.T. Lukasewycz. 2007. An Evaluation of BSAFs derived from superfund site data. Abstract presented at Fourth International Conference on Remediation of Contaminated Sediments. Savannah, Georgia.
- Burnham, W.A., J.H. Enderson, and T.J. Boardman. 1984. Variation in peregrine falcon eggs. *The Auk*. 101:578-583.

Burton, R.K. and S.B. Terrill. 2012. Least tern literature review and study plan development – Final report to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. H.T. Harvey and Associates, Los Gatos, CA. 57 pp.

California Department of Toxic Substances Control Human and Ecological Risk Division (DTSC/HERD). 2009. U. S. Navy and U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9 Biological Technical Assistance Group (Navy/BTAG) Toxicity Reference Values (TRVs) for Ecological Risk Assessment. February 24, 2009 update. Accessed <https://www.dtsc.ca.gov/AssessingRisk/eco.cfm>.

Clatterbuck, C.A., R.A. Lewison, N. Dodder, C. Zeeman and K. Schiff. 2016. Contaminant bioaccumulation in seabird eggs of the Southern California Bight. Technical Report 944. Southern California Coastal Water Research Project, Costa Mesa, CA. 64 pp.

Collis, K., D.D. Roby, K.W. Larson, L.J. Adrean, S.K. Nelson, A.F. Evans, N. Hostetter, D. Battaglia, D.E. Lyons, T. Marcells and A. Patterson. 2012. Trends in Caspian tern nesting and diet in San Francisco Bay: Conservation implications for terns and salmonids. *Waterbirds*. 35(1):25-34.

Cuthbert, F.J. and L.R. Wires. 1999. Caspian tern (*Hydropogone caspia*). The Birds of North America Online (A. Poole, ed.). Ithaca: Cornell Lab of Ornithology. Retrieved from the Birds of North America Online at <http://bna.birds.cornell.edu/bna/species/403> on March 1, 2016.

Dorr, B.S., J.J. Hatch and D.V. Weseloh. 2014. Double-crested Cormorant (*Phalacrocorax auritus*), The Birds of North America Online (A. Poole, Ed.). Ithaca: Cornell Lab of Ornithology; Retrieved from the Birds of North America Online: <http://bna.birds.cornell.edu/bna/species/441>.

Dunning, J.B. Jr. 1984. Body weights of 686 species of North American Birds. Western Bird Banding Association, Monograph No. 1. 40 pp.

Eisler, R. 1990. Chlordane hazards to fish, wildlife, and invertebrates: A synoptic review. Contaminant hazards reviews, Report No. 21. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Laurel, Maryland. 63 pp.

Fernie, K.J., J.L. Schutt, R.J. Lechter, I.J. Ritchie and D.M. Bird. 2009. Environmentally relevant concentrations of DE-71 and HBCD alter eggshell thickness and reproductive success of American kestrels. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 43(6):2124-2130.

Frost, N. 2014. California least tern breeding survey, 2013 season. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Wildlife Branch, Nongame Wildlife Program Report, 2014-06. Sacramento, CA. 20 pp + Appendices.

Granholm, S. 2016. Life history accounts for species in the California Wildlife Habitat Relationships (CWHR) System; Double-crested cormorant. California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Accessed March 2016 at <https://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cwhr/cawildlife.aspx>.

Harris, M.L. and J.E. Elliott. 2011. Effects of polychlorinated biphenyls, dibenzo-p-dioxins and dibenzofurans, and polybrominated diphenyl ethers in wild birds. In “Second Edition,

Environmental Contaminants in Biota, Interpreting Tissue Concentrations.” W. N. Beyer and J.P. Meador, eds. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida. pp. 477-528.

Hough, J.L., M.B. Baird., G.T. Sfeir, C.S. Pacini, D. Darrow and C. Wheelock. 1993. Benzo(a)pyrene enhances atherosclerosis in white Carneau and show racer pigeons. *Arterioscler. Thromb Vasc Biol.* 13(12):1721-1727.

Horn, M.H., and W.M. Dahdul. 1998. Prey resource base of the tern and skimmer colony at the Western Salt Works, South San Diego Bay, during the 1997 breeding season. Final Report, Grant #3 14-48-0001-95586. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Carlsbad, California. 28 pp.

Horn, M.H., and W.M. Dahdul. 1999. Prey resource base of the tern and skimmer colony at the Western Salt Works, South San Diego Bay, during the 1998 breeding season. Final Report, Grant #14-48-0001-95586. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Carlsbad, California. 28 pp.

Hoyt, D.F. 1979. Practical methods of estimating volume and fresh weight of bird eggs. *Auk* 96:73-77.

Hudson River Natural Resource Trustees. 2002. Work plan for the collection of eggs from spotted sandpipers, American woodcock, belted kingfisher, American robin, red-winged blackbird, and eastern phoebe associated with the Hudson River from Hudson Falls to Schodack Island, New York. March 2002. U.S. Department of Commerce, Silver Spring, MD. 60 pp.

Klasing, K.C. 2007. Effects of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon (PAH) ingestion on Japanese quail. Final report. California Department of Fish and Game, Office of Spill Prevention and Response. Accessed from <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=20093>.

Klasing, S. and R. Brodberg. 2008. Development of fish contaminant goals and advisory tissue levels for common contaminants in California Sport Fish: Chlordane, DDTs, Dieldrin, Methylmercury, PCBs, Selenium, and Toxaphene. State of California Pesticide and Environmental Toxicology Branch, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, California Environmental Protection Agency.

Leicht, A. 2014. Comparison of diets and dietary sampling methods for nesting California least terns (*Sterna antillarum browni*) at Alameda Point in San Francisco Bay, and Purisma Point on the central California coast. Masters Thesis, California State University, Fullerton, CA. 69 pp.

Lewis, T.L., D. Esler and W.S. Boyd. 2007. Foraging behaviors of surf scoters and white-winged scoters during spawning of Pacific herring. *The Condor.* 109(1):216-222

Lewison, R.L. and D.H. Deutschman. 2014. Long-term analysis of California least tern data. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Wildlife Management, Nongame Wildlife Unit Report. 2014-02. Sacramento, CA 29 pp. + App.

Massey, B.W. 1971. A breeding study of the California least tern. Wildlife Branch Administrative Report No. 71-9. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Sacramento, CA.

McKernan, M.A., B.A. Rattner, R.C. Hale, and M.A. Ottinger. 2009. Toxicity of polybrominated diphenyl ethers (DE-71) in chicken (*Gallus gallus*), mallard (*Anas platyrhynchos*), and

American kestrel (*Falco sparverius*) embryos and hatchlings. *Environ Toxicol Chem* 28(5):1007–1017

Nagy, K.A. 2001. Food requirements of wild animals: Predictive equations for free-living mammals, reptiles, and birds. *Nutrition Abstracts and Reviews, Series B.* 71(10):21R-31R.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). 1989. A summary of data on tissue contamination from the first three years (1986-1988) of the mussel watch project. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS ORCA 49. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Rockville MD. 164 pp.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). 1993. Sampling and analytical methods of the National Status and Trends Program, national benthic surveillance and mussel watch projects 1984-1992. Volume 1. Overview and summary of methods. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS ORCA 71. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Silver Spring MD. 157 pp.

Newsted, J.L., P.D. Jones, K. Coady and J.P. Giesy. 2005. Avian toxicity reference values for perfluorooctane sulfonate. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 39:9357-9362.

Ohlendorf, H.M., F.C. Schaffner, T.W. Custer and C.J. Stafford. 1985. Reproduction and organochlorine contaminants in terns at San Diego Bay. *Colonial Waterbirds.* 8(1):42-53.

Ouellet, J.F., C. Vanpe and M. Guillemette. 2013. The body size-dependent diet composition of North American sea ducks in Winter. *PLoS ONE* 8(6): e65667.
doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0065667.

Pierotti, R.J. and C.A. Annett. 1995. Western gull (*Larus occidentalis*), *The Birds of North America Online* (A. Poole, Ed.). Ithaca: Cornell Lab of Ornithology; Retrieved from the Birds of North America Online: <http://bna.birds.cornell.edu/bna/species/174>.

Rattner, B.A., R.S. Lazarus, G.H. Heinz, N.K. Karouna-Renier and R.C. Hale. 2011. Apparent tolerance of common tern (*Sterna hirundo*) embryos to a pentabrominated diphenyl ether mixture (DE-71). U.S. Geological Survey-Patuxant Wildlife Research Center, Beltsville, MD.

Remsen, J.V. 1978. Bird species of special concern in California: An annotated list of declining or vulnerable bird species. State of California, Department of Fish and Game.

Ridgway, M. 2010. A review of estimates of daily energy expenditure and food intake in cormorants (*Phalacrocorax* spp.). *J. Great Lakes Res.* 36(1):93-99.

Robertson, I. 1974. The food of nesting Double-crested and Pelagic Cormorants at Mandarte Island, British Columbia, with notes on feeding ecology. *Condor* 76:346-348.

Roby, D.D., K. Collis, D.E. Lyons, D.P. Craig, J.Y. Adkins, A.M. Myers, and R.M. Suryan. 2002. Effects of colony relocation on diet and productivity of Caspian terns. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 66:662-673.

San Diego Natural History Museum (SDNHM). 2016. San Diego County Bird Atlas, on line edition. <http://www.sdnhm.org/science/birds-and-mammals/projects/san-diego-county-bird-atlas/>.

Scheuhammer, A.M., M.W. Meyer, M.B. Sandheinrich and M.W. Murray. 2007. Effects of environmental methylmercury on the health of wild birds, mammals and fish. *Ambio*. 36(1):12-18.

Sedlak, M.D. and D.J. Greig. 2012. Perfluoroalkyl compounds (PFCs) in wildlife from an urban estuary. *J. Environ. Monit.* 14:146-154.

B nbn Shore, R.F., M.G. Pereira, L.A. Walker and D.R. Thompson. 2011. Mercury in nonmarine birds and mammals. In "Second Edition, Environmental Contaminants in Biota, Interpreting Tissue Concentrations." W. N. Beyer and J.P. Meador, eds. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida. pp. 609-624.

Southern California Coastal Water Research Program (SCCWRP). 2013. Southern California Bight 2013 Regional Monitoring Survey (Bight '13) Quality Assurance Manual. Prepared by the Bight '13 Contaminant Impact Assessment Committee. June 13, 2013. Southern California Coastal Water Research Program, Costa Mesa, CA. 55 pp. <http://www.sccwrp.org/Documents/BightDocuments/Bight13Documents/Bight13PlanningDocuments.aspx>

State (California) Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2009. Report on San Diego Bay toxic sediment cleanup as required by the supplemental report to the 2008 budget act. California Water Resources Control Board, Sacramento, CA. 15 pp.

State (California) Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2010. 2010 Integrated Report (Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List) USEPA approved November 12, 2010. http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/tmdl/integrated2010.shtml

Stickel, L.F., W.H. Stickel, R.A. Dyrland, and D.L. Hughes. 1983. Oxychlorane, HCS-3260, and nonachlor in birds: lethal residues and loss rates. *Journal of toxicology and environmental health* 12:611-622

Stickel, L.F., S.N. Wiemeyer, and L.J. Blus. 1973. Pesticide residues in eggs of wild birds: Adjustments for loss of moisture and lipid. *Bull. Environ. Contam. Toxicol.* 9:193-196.

Su, H., F. Wu, R. Zhang, X. Ahao, Y. Mu, C. Feng and J.P. Giesy. 2014. Toxicity reference values for protecting aquatic birds in China from the effects of polychlorinated biphenyls. pp. 59-82 in D.M. Whiteacre (ed). *Reviews of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology* Volume 230, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-04411-8_3. Springer International Publishing Co. Switzerland.

Thompson, B.C., J.A. Jackson, J. Burger, L.A. Hill, E.M. Kirsch and J.L. Atwood. 1997. Least Tern (*Sternula antillarum*), *The Birds of North America Online* (A. Poole, Ed.). Ithaca: Cornell Lab of Ornithology; Retrieved from the *Birds of North America Online*: <http://bna.birds.cornell.edu/bna/species/290doi:10.2173/bna.290> February 29, 2016.

Tierra Data Inc. (TDI). 2009. San Diego Bay Avian Species Surveys 2006-2007. Under contract and funded by Naval Facilities Engineering Command Southwest and San Diego Unified Port District. Tierra Data Inc., Escondido, CA. 212 pp.

Tierra Data Inc. (TDI). 2011. San Diego Bay Avian Species Surveys 2009-2010. Under contract and funded by Naval Facilities Engineering Command Southwest and San Diego Unified Port District. Tierra Data Inc., Escondido, CA. 196 pp.

Trapp, J.L., and S.L. Hanisch. 2000 (February). Cormorant food habit[s] and potential impacts on sport and commercial fisheries: an annotated bibliography. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Migratory Bird Management, Arlington, Virginia.
<http://migratorybirds.fws.gov/issues/cormorant/diet.pdf>.

U.S. Department of the Interior (USDOI). 1998. Guidelines for the interpretation of the biological effects of selected constituents in biota, water, and sediment. National Irrigation Water Quality Program. Information Report 3. Bureau of Reclamation, Denver, Colorado. 198 pp.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2003. Evaluation of the Clean Water Act Section 304(a) human health criterion for methylmercury: protectiveness for threatened and endangered wildlife in California. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office, Environmental Contaminants Division. Sacramento, California. 96 pp + appendix.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2006. San Diego Bay National Wildlife Refuge, Sweetwater Marsh and South San Diego Bay Units, Final Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Environmental Impact Statement. San Diego National Wildlife Refuge Complex, Carlsbad, California.

U.S. Department of the Navy, Southwest Division (USDoN, SWDIV). 2013. San Diego Bay Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan, and San Diego Unified Port District. September 2013. San Diego, CA. Prepared by Tierra Data Systems, Escondido, CA. 686 pp.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 1992. National Study of Chemical Residues in Fish, Volume II. EPA 823-R-92-008b. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Science and Technology, Washington, D.C. 494 pp.

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1995. Great Lakes water quality initiative criteria documents for the protection of wildlife - DDT, Mercury, 2,3,7,8-TCDD and PCBs. EPA-820-B-95-008. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Washington, D.C. 82 pp.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2007. Ecological soil screening levels for DDT and metabolites. OSWER Directive 9285. 7-57. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response. Washington, D. C.

USGS. 2016. Biological and ecotoxicological characteristics of terrestrial vertebrates at
<http://www.pwrc.usgs.gov/contaminants-online/pages/SpeciesReports/SRintro.htm>.

Zeeman, C., S.K. Taylor, J. Gibson, A. Little, and C. Gorbics. 2008. Characterizing exposure and potential impacts of contaminants on seabirds nesting at South San Diego Bay Unit of the San

Diego National Wildlife Refuge (Salt Works, San Diego Bay) - Final Report. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office, Carlsbad, California. 53 pp.

Zhang, R., F. Wu, H. Li, G. Guo, C. Feng, J.P. Giesy and H. Chang. 2013. Toxicity reference values and tissue residue criteria for protecting avian wildlife exposed to methylmercury in China. pp. 53-80 in D. M. Whiteacre (ed). Reviews of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology, Volume 223, DOI 10. 1007/978-1-4614-5577-6_3, Springer International Publishing Co., Switzerland.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A. FOOD WEB CHEMISTRY SUMMARY

Table A1. Chemistry summary for benthic invertebrates.

Common Name	Analyte	Region	Min	Mean	Median	Max	StdDev	Count	Units
Crustacea	Chlordanes	North	0.05	0.63	0.05	2.66	1.14	5	ng/g ww
Mollusks	Chlordanes	North	0.05	0.37	0.05	1.00	0.55	3	ng/g ww
Polychaetes	Chlordanes	North	0.05	1.93	1.98	4.61	1.76	6	ng/g ww
Crustacea	Chlordanes	Central	0.05	0.10	0.05	0.24	0.10	4	ng/g ww
Mollusks	Chlordanes	Central	0.05	0.83	0.55	2.15	1.00	4	ng/g ww
Polychaetes	Chlordanes	Central	0.05	0.76	0.05	2.14	1.00	6	ng/g ww
Crustacea	Chlordanes	South	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.00	4	ng/g ww
Mollusks	Chlordanes	South	0.05	0.12	0.05	0.33	0.14	4	ng/g ww
Polychaetes	Chlordanes	South	0.05	0.36	0.05	1.90	0.75	6	ng/g ww
Crustacea	DDTs	North	4.08	9.19	6.82	21.48	6.98	5	ng/g ww
Mollusks	DDTs	North	0.05	14.31	9.79	33.08	16.97	3	ng/g ww
Polychaetes	DDTs	North	7.44	9.11	8.55	11.22	1.51	6	ng/g ww
Crustacea	DDTs	Central	1.06	3.63	3.46	6.52	2.24	4	ng/g ww
Mollusks	DDTs	Central	0.05	3.45	3.18	7.36	3.14	4	ng/g ww
Polychaetes	DDTs	Central	1.81	5.35	4.43	11.52	3.29	6	ng/g ww
Crustacea	DDTs	South	0.05	4.63	3.82	10.82	4.82	4	ng/g ww
Mollusks	DDTs	South	0.90	2.51	2.35	4.42	1.64	4	ng/g ww
Polychaetes	DDTs	South	2.79	6.96	4.26	21.53	7.20	6	ng/g ww
Crustacea	Dieldrin	North	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.00	3	ng/g ww
Polychaetes	Dieldrin	North	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.00	3	ng/g ww
Crustacea	Dieldrin	Central	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.00	2	ng/g ww
Mollusks	Dieldrin	Central	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	NA	1	ng/g ww
Polychaetes	Dieldrin	Central	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.00	3	ng/g ww
Crustacea	Dieldrin	South	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.00	2	ng/g ww
Mollusks	Dieldrin	South	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	NA	1	ng/g ww
Polychaetes	Dieldrin	South	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.00	3	ng/g ww
Crustacea	Mercury	North	22.20	29.86	31.37	34.50	5.81	4	ng/g ww
Mollusks	Mercury	North	49.20	68.44	68.44	87.68	27.21	2	ng/g ww
Polychaetes	Mercury	North	15.65	54.63	41.64	135.00	41.96	6	ng/g ww
Crustacea	Mercury	Central	23.70	38.85	38.40	54.90	12.86	4	ng/g ww
Mollusks	Mercury	Central	33.43	43.22	38.60	62.26	13.35	4	ng/g ww
Polychaetes	Mercury	Central	50.50	162.11	102.05	429.46	148.14	6	ng/g ww
Crustacea	Mercury	South	23.40	28.05	28.05	32.70	6.58	2	ng/g ww
Mollusks	Mercury	South	12.60	23.80	22.57	37.47	12.29	4	ng/g ww
Polychaetes	Mercury	South	37.05	71.29	41.75	164.60	62.25	4	ng/g ww

Table A1. Continued.

Common Name	Analyte	Region	Min	Mean	Median	Max	StdDev	Count	Units
Crustacea	PAHs	North	58.00	165.02	213.20	248.00	86.02	5	ng/g ww
Mollusks	PAHs	North	158.40	211.94	159.76	317.66	91.56	3	ng/g ww
Polychaetes	PAHs	North	106.77	2274.42	162.55	12801.74	5157.88	6	ng/g ww
Crustacea	PAHs	Central	9.80	57.99	53.26	115.63	49.02	4	ng/g ww
Mollusks	PAHs	Central	41.25	75.66	69.34	122.69	37.66	4	ng/g ww
Polychaetes	PAHs	Central	27.94	105.17	105.40	155.60	48.42	6	ng/g ww
Crustacea	PAHs	South	2.50	86.65	54.30	235.50	109.10	4	ng/g ww
Mollusks	PAHs	South	24.60	42.86	41.27	64.30	19.49	4	ng/g ww
Polychaetes	PAHs	South	32.60	135.16	135.88	200.30	57.15	6	ng/g ww
Crustacea	PBDEs	North	0.70	2.08	2.25	2.96	0.84	5	ng/g ww
Mollusks	PBDEs	North	0.59	1.82	0.86	4.00	1.90	3	ng/g ww
Polychaetes	PBDEs	North	1.23	3.45	3.30	6.17	1.92	6	ng/g ww
Crustacea	PBDEs	Central	2.16	4.20	4.14	6.36	1.85	4	ng/g ww
Mollusks	PBDEs	Central	0.39	1.06	0.96	1.93	0.68	4	ng/g ww
Polychaetes	PBDEs	Central	1.89	5.46	5.11	10.51	3.88	6	ng/g ww
Crustacea	PBDEs	South	0.05	29.39	9.02	99.45	46.90	4	ng/g ww
Mollusks	PBDEs	South	0.05	1.41	1.17	3.26	1.57	4	ng/g ww
Polychaetes	PBDEs	South	2.96	9.18	7.81	21.68	7.36	6	ng/g ww
Crustacea	PCBs	North	16.84	115.55	151.47	168.59	65.72	5	ng/g ww
Mollusks	PCBs	North	18.94	41.87	42.47	64.19	22.63	3	ng/g ww
Polychaetes	PCBs	North	28.52	121.67	135.25	166.71	49.52	6	ng/g ww
Crustacea	PCBs	Central	57.33	92.54	80.98	150.87	41.58	4	ng/g ww
Mollusks	PCBs	Central	10.18	75.59	61.38	169.42	74.66	4	ng/g ww
Polychaetes	PCBs	Central	111.85	167.71	152.53	283.07	63.94	6	ng/g ww
Crustacea	PCBs	South	28.80	60.27	44.48	123.31	44.06	4	ng/g ww
Mollusks	PCBs	South	2.70	12.76	12.50	23.35	8.74	4	ng/g ww
Polychaetes	PCBs	South	28.43	77.24	64.48	146.21	44.98	6	ng/g ww

Table A2. Chemistry summary for plankton.

Common Name	Analyte	Region	Min	Mean	Median	Max	StdDev	Count	Units
Plankton	Chlordanes	North	0.05	0.59	0.52	1.26	0.55	4	ng/g ww
Plankton	Chlordanes	Central	0.05	0.16	0.05	0.59	0.24	5	ng/g ww
Plankton	Chlordanes	South	0.05	0.20	0.14	0.45	0.19	4	ng/g ww
Plankton	DDTs	North	0.05	8.00	5.46	21.02	9.10	4	ng/g ww
Plankton	DDTs	Central	0.05	1.20	0.05	3.59	1.64	5	ng/g ww
Plankton	DDTs	South	0.05	10.49	8.49	24.95	10.55	4	ng/g ww
Plankton	Mercury	North	5.55	22.28	29.35	31.95	14.55	3	ng/g ww
Plankton	Mercury	Central	15.02	40.43	34.18	72.08	29.04	3	ng/g ww
Plankton	Mercury	South	6.41	12.65	13.55	17.99	5.84	3	ng/g ww
Plankton	PAHs	North	43.75	284.94	181.70	629.38	306.16	3	ng/g ww
Plankton	PAHs	Central	60.80	159.98	131.18	287.94	116.27	3	ng/g ww
Plankton	PAHs	South	50.31	61.17	60.09	73.10	11.43	3	ng/g ww
Plankton	PBDEs	North	7.59	14.73	10.37	30.59	10.66	4	ng/g ww
Plankton	PBDEs	Central	1.77	27.31	8.96	108.27	45.48	5	ng/g ww
Plankton	PBDEs	South	1.93	8.14	3.47	23.70	10.40	4	ng/g ww
Plankton	PCBs	North	0.10	42.15	46.96	74.57	37.06	4	ng/g ww
Plankton	PCBs	Central	3.37	84.64	86.01	169.45	60.22	5	ng/g ww
Plankton	PCBs	South	6.82	43.24	50.20	65.74	25.47	4	ng/g ww

Table A3. Chemistry summary for fish.

Common Name	Analyte	Region	Min	Mean	Median	Max	StdDev	Count	Units
Barred sand bass	Chlordanes	North	2.03	2.64	2.76	3.02	0.43	4	ng/g ww
Black perch	Chlordanes	North	0.58	3.20	3.20	5.83	3.71	2	ng/g ww
California halibut	Chlordanes	North	0.05	1.09	0.88	2.65	0.85	7	ng/g ww
Goby sp.	Chlordanes	North	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.23	NA	1	ng/g ww
Shiner perch	Chlordanes	North	0.03	3.55	2.88	7.76	3.91	3	ng/g ww
Spotted sand bass	Chlordanes	North	1.73	3.23	3.11	4.85	1.56	3	ng/g ww
Topsmelt	Chlordanes	North	1.24	2.17	1.85	3.43	1.13	3	ng/g ww
Barred sand bass	Chlordanes	Central	0.63	1.70	1.70	2.77	1.51	2	ng/g ww
California halibut	Chlordanes	Central	0.51	1.27	1.16	3.08	0.90	7	ng/g ww
Deepbody anchovy	Chlordanes	Central	2.27	4.49	4.51	6.65	2.18	6	ng/g ww
Goby sp.	Chlordanes	Central	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	NA	1	ng/g ww
Shiner perch	Chlordanes	Central	1.27	2.55	2.55	3.83	1.82	2	ng/g ww
Slough anchovy	Chlordanes	Central	0.05	1.11	1.05	2.52	0.68	8	ng/g ww
Spotted sand bass	Chlordanes	Central	1.28	2.57	2.91	3.95	1.20	5	ng/g ww
Topsmelt	Chlordanes	Central	0.54	0.88	0.98	1.11	0.30	3	ng/g ww
Arrow goby	Chlordanes	South	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	NA	1	ng/g ww
Barred sand bass	Chlordanes	South	0.05	0.74	0.24	1.93	1.03	3	ng/g ww
California halibut	Chlordanes	South	0.29	0.96	0.84	1.99	0.58	6	ng/g ww
California killifish	Chlordanes	South	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.00	2	ng/g ww
Deepbody anchovy	Chlordanes	South	0.05	0.87	0.76	2.25	0.86	5	ng/g ww
Goby sp.	Chlordanes	South	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	NA	1	ng/g ww
Northern anchovy	Chlordanes	South	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.00	2	ng/g ww
Round stingray	Chlordanes	South	10.21	10.21	10.21	10.21	NA	1	ng/g ww
Shiner perch	Chlordanes	South	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	NA	1	ng/g ww
Slough anchovy	Chlordanes	South	0.05	1.82	1.82	3.58	2.50	2	ng/g ww
Spotted sand bass	Chlordanes	South	1.85	2.62	2.63	3.38	0.76	3	ng/g ww
Topsmelt	Chlordanes	South	0.05	0.71	0.58	1.50	0.73	3	ng/g ww
Barred sand bass	DDTs	North	11.31	20.97	16.12	40.32	13.27	4	ng/g ww
Black perch	DDTs	North	6.39	13.25	13.25	20.11	9.70	2	ng/g ww
California halibut	DDTs	North	2.52	13.91	12.25	37.71	11.14	7	ng/g ww
Goby sp.	DDTs	North	10.91	10.91	10.91	10.91	NA	1	ng/g ww
Shiner perch	DDTs	North	4.08	15.67	20.87	22.05	10.05	3	ng/g ww
Spotted sand bass	DDTs	North	10.20	12.98	12.72	16.01	2.91	3	ng/g ww
Topsmelt	DDTs	North	6.45	8.90	8.55	11.69	2.64	3	ng/g ww
Barred sand bass	DDTs	Central	4.82	12.94	12.94	21.06	11.48	2	ng/g ww

Table A3. Continued.

Common Name	Analyte	Region	Min	Mean	Median	Max	StdDev	Count	Units
California halibut	DDTs	Central	4.82	9.31	9.31	13.48	3.20	7	ng/g ww
Deepbody anchovy	DDTs	Central	16.73	30.10	28.75	46.36	14.01	6	ng/g ww
Goby sp.	DDTs	Central	10.33	10.33	10.33	10.33	NA	1	ng/g ww
Shiner perch	DDTs	Central	12.48	14.38	14.38	16.27	2.68	2	ng/g ww
Slough anchovy	DDTs	Central	8.03	10.61	9.95	14.89	2.54	8	ng/g ww
Spotted sand bass	DDTs	Central	3.85	8.67	10.06	13.22	3.84	5	ng/g ww
Topsmelt	DDTs	Central	4.18	6.56	5.06	10.44	3.39	3	ng/g ww
Arrow goby	DDTs	South	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	NA	1	ng/g ww
Barred sand bass	DDTs	South	7.45	11.71	13.58	14.10	3.70	3	ng/g ww
California halibut	DDTs	South	8.64	11.84	11.93	15.56	2.25	6	ng/g ww
California killifish	DDTs	South	1.81	6.53	6.53	11.24	6.67	2	ng/g ww
Deepbody anchovy	DDTs	South	6.41	9.56	8.67	15.43	3.73	5	ng/g ww
Goby sp.	DDTs	South	10.62	10.62	10.62	10.62	NA	1	ng/g ww
Northern anchovy	DDTs	South	8.17	8.89	8.89	9.61	1.02	2	ng/g ww
Round stingray	DDTs	South	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	NA	1	ng/g ww
Shiner perch	DDTs	South	11.33	11.33	11.33	11.33	NA	1	ng/g ww
Slough anchovy	DDTs	South	6.19	18.54	18.54	30.88	17.46	2	ng/g ww
Spotted sand bass	DDTs	South	9.94	12.24	10.98	15.80	3.13	3	ng/g ww
Topsmelt	DDTs	South	3.69	5.08	3.79	7.76	2.32	3	ng/g ww
Barred sand bass	Dieldrin	North	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.00	4	ng/g ww
California halibut	Dieldrin	North	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.00	4	ng/g ww
Barred sand bass	Dieldrin	Central	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.00	2	ng/g ww
California halibut	Dieldrin	Central	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.00	3	ng/g ww
Spotted sand bass	Dieldrin	Central	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.00	2	ng/g ww
Barred sand bass	Dieldrin	South	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.00	3	ng/g ww
California halibut	Dieldrin	South	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.00	2	ng/g ww
Round stingray	Dieldrin	South	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	NA	1	ng/g ww
Barred sand bass	Mercury	North	57.50	65.25	66.05	71.40	6.63	4	ng/g ww
Black perch	Mercury	North	14.09	18.75	18.75	23.41	6.59	2	ng/g ww
California halibut	Mercury	North	23.72	41.08	46.40	51.60	11.52	7	ng/g ww
Shiner perch	Mercury	North	22.45	28.53	27.19	35.97	6.86	3	ng/g ww
Spotted sand bass	Mercury	North	56.36	72.74	59.00	102.88	26.13	3	ng/g ww
Topsmelt	Mercury	North	16.00	19.00	19.00	22.00	3.00	3	ng/g ww
Barred sand bass	Mercury	Central	61.10	64.45	64.45	67.80	4.74	2	ng/g ww
California halibut	Mercury	Central	35.76	73.61	45.26	239.20	73.49	7	ng/g ww
Deepbody anchovy	Mercury	Central	32.00	69.67	69.00	109.00	38.46	6	ng/g ww
Shiner perch	Mercury	Central	16.42	31.40	31.40	46.38	21.18	2	ng/g ww
Slough anchovy	Mercury	Central	19.00	30.14	27.00	46.00	10.07	7	ng/g ww
Spotted sand bass	Mercury	Central	86.20	104.24	106.80	124.45	15.84	5	ng/g ww
Topsmelt	Mercury	Central	31.00	46.33	46.00	62.00	15.50	3	ng/g ww

Table A3. Continued.

Common Name	Analyte	Region	Min	Mean	Median	Max	StdDev	Count	Units
Arrow goby	Mercury	South	46.00	46.00	46.00	46.00	NA	1	ng/g ww
Barred sand bass	Mercury	South	55.50	70.43	69.10	86.70	15.64	3	ng/g ww
California halibut	Mercury	South	22.87	45.87	46.43	62.10	15.34	6	ng/g ww
California killifish	Mercury	South	26.00	26.00	26.00	26.00	0.00	2	ng/g ww
Deepbody anchovy	Mercury	South	19.00	23.40	24.00	26.00	2.70	5	ng/g ww
Northern anchovy	Mercury	South	35.00	35.00	35.00	35.00	NA	1	ng/g ww
Round stingray	Mercury	South	151.30	151.30	151.30	151.30	NA	1	ng/g ww
Shiner perch	Mercury	South	14.23	14.23	14.23	14.23	NA	1	ng/g ww
Slough anchovy	Mercury	South	19.00	24.87	24.87	30.75	8.31	2	ng/g ww
Spotted sand bass	Mercury	South	60.42	97.65	79.03	153.51	49.26	3	ng/g ww
Topsmelt	Mercury	South	17.00	30.00	31.00	42.00	12.53	3	ng/g ww
Barred sand bass	PAHs	North	7.60	11.05	9.90	16.80	4.31	4	ng/g ww
Black perch	PAHs	North	15.02	25.79	25.79	36.57	15.24	2	ng/g ww
California halibut	PAHs	North	2.50	7.75	7.99	13.10	5.05	7	ng/g ww
Goby sp.	PAHs	North	91.80	91.80	91.80	91.80	NA	1	ng/g ww
Shiner perch	PAHs	North	19.80	23.23	24.64	25.27	2.99	3	ng/g ww
Spotted sand bass	PAHs	North	10.90	14.98	16.30	17.73	3.60	3	ng/g ww
Barred sand bass	PAHs	Central	6.20	7.50	7.50	8.80	1.84	2	ng/g ww
California halibut	PAHs	Central	1.00	9.64	9.86	23.27	8.00	7	ng/g ww
Goby sp.	PAHs	Central	50.90	50.90	50.90	50.90	NA	1	ng/g ww
Shiner perch	PAHs	Central	17.89	22.59	22.59	27.29	6.64	2	ng/g ww
Spotted sand bass	PAHs	Central	6.80	13.36	13.80	20.98	5.31	5	ng/g ww
Barred sand bass	PAHs	South	2.70	6.43	7.30	9.30	3.38	3	ng/g ww
California halibut	PAHs	South	1.00	12.87	13.63	22.45	7.04	6	ng/g ww
Goby sp.	PAHs	South	58.20	58.20	58.20	58.20	NA	1	ng/g ww
Round stingray	PAHs	South	30.30	30.30	30.30	30.30	NA	1	ng/g ww
Shiner perch	PAHs	South	21.61	21.61	21.61	21.61	NA	1	ng/g ww
Slough anchovy	PAHs	South	37.46	37.46	37.46	37.46	NA	1	ng/g ww
Spotted sand bass	PAHs	South	13.69	16.09	16.42	18.15	2.25	3	ng/g ww
Barred sand bass	PBDEs	North	2.04	4.14	3.18	8.17	2.83	4	ng/g ww
Black perch	PBDEs	North	2.86	5.02	5.02	7.19	3.06	2	ng/g ww
California halibut	PBDEs	North	0.81	1.45	1.37	2.38	0.52	7	ng/g ww
Goby sp.	PBDEs	North	4.97	4.97	4.97	4.97	NA	1	ng/g ww
Shiner perch	PBDEs	North	3.29	7.88	7.84	12.51	4.61	3	ng/g ww
Spotted sand bass	PBDEs	North	1.06	1.91	1.25	3.41	1.31	3	ng/g ww
Topsmelt	PBDEs	North	3.67	5.53	5.30	7.63	1.99	3	ng/g ww

Table A3. Continued.

Common Name	Analyte	Region	Min	Mean	Median	Max	StdDev	Count	Units
Barred sand bass	PBDEs	Central	2.92	4.97	4.97	7.02	2.90	2	ng/g ww
California halibut	PBDEs	Central	0.46	1.83	1.70	3.84	1.16	7	ng/g ww
Deepbody anchovy	PBDEs	Central	0.05	0.09	0.07	0.19	0.06	6	ng/g ww
Goby sp.	PBDEs	Central	1.98	1.98	1.98	1.98	NA	1	ng/g ww
Shiner perch	PBDEs	Central	8.81	10.29	10.29	11.77	2.10	2	ng/g ww
Slough anchovy	PBDEs	Central	0.05	0.95	0.32	3.36	1.35	8	ng/g ww
Spotted sand bass	PBDEs	Central	0.14	0.79	0.55	1.79	0.71	5	ng/g ww
Topsmelt	PBDEs	Central	1.49	6.33	2.31	15.20	7.69	3	ng/g ww
Arrow goby	PBDEs	South	19.53	19.53	19.53	19.53	NA	1	ng/g ww
Barred sand bass	PBDEs	South	1.51	1.90	1.79	2.41	0.46	3	ng/g ww
California halibut	PBDEs	South	0.45	2.09	1.56	4.19	1.67	6	ng/g ww
California killifish	PBDEs	South	0.92	2.64	2.64	4.36	2.43	2	ng/g ww
Deepbody anchovy	PBDEs	South	0.05	0.12	0.05	0.28	0.10	5	ng/g ww
Goby sp.	PBDEs	South	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.20	NA	1	ng/g ww
Northern anchovy	PBDEs	South	0.05	8.60	8.60	17.16	12.10	2	ng/g ww
Round stingray	PBDEs	South	10.08	10.08	10.08	10.08	NA	1	ng/g ww
Shiner perch	PBDEs	South	1.87	1.87	1.87	1.87	NA	1	ng/g ww
Slough anchovy	PBDEs	South	0.56	1.22	1.22	1.88	0.94	2	ng/g ww
Spotted sand bass	PBDEs	South	0.43	1.00	0.86	1.72	0.65	3	ng/g ww
Topsmelt	PBDEs	South	3.53	10.45	10.93	16.88	6.69	3	ng/g ww
Barred sand bass	PCBs	North	208.84	230.22	232.88	246.27	17.35	4	ng/g ww
Black perch	PCBs	North	47.23	239.37	239.37	431.51	271.72	2	ng/g ww
California halibut	PCBs	North	25.69	162.79	186.84	259.45	75.03	7	ng/g ww
Goby sp.	PCBs	North	265.13	265.13	265.13	265.13	NA	1	ng/g ww
Shiner perch	PCBs	North	29.95	182.71	130.05	388.14	184.81	3	ng/g ww
Spotted sand bass	PCBs	North	147.61	289.86	303.61	418.37	135.90	3	ng/g ww
Topsmelt	PCBs	North	98.53	146.09	129.81	209.93	57.46	3	ng/g ww
Barred sand bass	PCBs	Central	117.92	243.40	243.40	368.87	177.45	2	ng/g ww
California halibut	PCBs	Central	131.14	218.10	172.80	358.71	87.57	7	ng/g ww
Deepbody anchovy	PCBs	Central	243.18	356.39	358.82	458.46	111.00	6	ng/g ww
Goby sp.	PCBs	Central	327.20	327.20	327.20	327.20	NA	1	ng/g ww
Shiner perch	PCBs	Central	94.82	209.04	209.04	323.26	161.53	2	ng/g ww
Slough anchovy	PCBs	Central	217.52	260.13	258.52	322.02	37.41	8	ng/g ww
Spotted sand bass	PCBs	Central	148.49	320.29	342.16	570.60	168.40	5	ng/g ww
Topsmelt	PCBs	Central	147.89	198.17	195.48	251.15	51.68	3	ng/g ww

Table A3. Continued.

Common Name	Analyte	Region	Min	Mean	Median	Max	StdDev	Count	Units
Arrow goby	PCBs	South	98.30	98.30	98.30	98.30	NA	1	ng/g ww
Barred sand bass	PCBs	South	81.38	104.34	100.97	130.66	24.81	3	ng/g ww
California halibut	PCBs	South	67.95	143.79	161.57	190.68	45.89	6	ng/g ww
California killifish	PCBs	South	38.40	68.04	68.04	97.67	41.91	2	ng/g ww
Deepbody anchovy	PCBs	South	90.55	149.96	171.62	201.03	46.86	5	ng/g ww
Goby sp.	PCBs	South	54.22	54.22	54.22	54.22	NA	1	ng/g ww
Northern anchovy	PCBs	South	208.47	219.59	219.59	230.72	15.73	2	ng/g ww
Round stingray	PCBs	South	418.67	418.67	418.67	418.67	NA	1	ng/g ww
Shiner perch	PCBs	South	85.51	85.51	85.51	85.51	NA	1	ng/g ww
Slough anchovy	PCBs	South	197.15	199.93	199.93	202.72	3.94	2	ng/g ww
Spotted sand bass	PCBs	South	154.45	236.25	259.54	294.75	72.99	3	ng/g ww
Topsmelt	PCBs	South	69.34	98.62	92.24	134.29	32.94	3	ng/g ww

Table A4. Chemistry summary for seabird eggs.

Common Name	Analyte	Region	Min	Mean	Median	Max	StdDev	Count	Units
California least tern	Chlordanes	North	4.50	6.01	5.12	8.27	1.64	5	ng/g fw
Western gull	Chlordanes	North	0.14	1.68	1.26	4.10	1.54	8	ng/g fw
California least tern	Chlordanes	South	2.04	5.52	4.12	17.51	4.11	13	ng/g fw
Caspian tern	Chlordanes	South	2.14	9.53	7.51	24.64	6.58	10	ng/g fw
Double-crested cormorant	Chlordanes	South	0.04	1.37	0.88	3.49	1.44	8	ng/g fw
California least tern	DDTs	North	70.95	118.05	113.85	193.47	46.33	5	ng/g fw
Western gull	DDTs	North	127.73	425.62	348.53	1000.46	269.23	8	ng/g fw
California least tern	DDTs	South	43.32	92.38	86.88	187.35	40.87	13	ng/g fw
Caspian tern	DDTs	South	511.30	1477.72	1384.63	2765.57	866.31	10	ng/g fw
Double-crested cormorant	DDTs	South	293.54	1276.46	874.46	3643.55	1096.40	8	ng/g fw
California least tern	Mercury	North	176.29	223.96	240.41	270.27	39.16	5	ng/g fw
Western gull	Mercury	North	18.19	61.22	62.83	125.67	37.15	8	ng/g fw
California least tern	Mercury	South	107.62	167.98	167.38	210.88	38.60	12	ng/g fw
Caspian tern	Mercury	South	326.18	451.04	395.47	1019.69	204.07	10	ng/g fw
Double-crested cormorant	Mercury	South	30.88	71.13	49.96	192.30	56.01	8	ng/g fw
California least tern	PBDEs	North	30.09	38.81	32.71	52.05	10.55	5	ng/g fw
Western gull	PBDEs	North	53.12	176.19	176.23	303.01	96.23	8	ng/g fw
California least tern	PBDEs	South	21.28	51.84	45.27	101.85	23.36	13	ng/g fw
Caspian tern	PBDEs	South	82.93	243.82	249.87	413.87	110.48	10	ng/g fw
Double-crested cormorant	PBDEs	South	8.77	88.86	29.62	280.29	99.13	8	ng/g fw
California least tern	PCBs	North	134.08	264.24	158.10	685.02	236.53	5	ng/g fw
Western gull	PCBs	North	251.85	517.52	482.90	856.91	233.87	8	ng/g fw
California least tern	PCBs	South	64.30	180.21	172.76	303.83	83.12	13	ng/g fw
Caspian tern	PCBs	South	133.57	478.90	424.03	1026.70	269.55	10	ng/g fw
Double-crested cormorant	PCBs	South	171.78	727.83	272.18	1950.77	715.49	8	ng/g fw
California least tern	PFCs	North	9.35	14.75	12.54	25.84	6.39	5	ng/g fw
California least tern	PFCs	South	12.61	32.28	27.12	72.53	20.71	12	ng/g fw
Caspian tern	PFCs	South	7.54	28.48	29.63	63.15	17.68	10	ng/g fw

APPENDIX B. BSAF SUMMARY

Table B1. BSAF summary for invertebrates.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	BSAF (ng/g ww) / (ng/g dw)	Mean	Median	Count
Crustacea	North	Chlordanes	B13-8109	0.34	0.05	6.80	12.60	1.00	5
Crustacea	North	Chlordanes	B13-8118	2.66	0.05	53.20			
Crustacea	North	Chlordanes	B13-8122	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Crustacea	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-26	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Crustacea	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-30	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Mollusks	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-26	1.00	0.05	20.05	7.35	1.00	3
Mollusks	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-27	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Mollusks	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-30	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Polychaetes	North	Chlordanes	B13-8109	2.38	0.05	47.60	38.60	39.64	6
Polychaetes	North	Chlordanes	B13-8118	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Polychaetes	North	Chlordanes	B13-8122	2.91	0.05	58.20			
Polychaetes	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-26	4.61	0.05	92.10			
Polychaetes	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-27	1.58	0.05	31.68			
Polychaetes	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-30	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Crustacea	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8060	0.05	0.05	1.00	1.95	1.00	4
Crustacea	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8078	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Crustacea	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-01	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Crustacea	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-40	0.24	0.05	4.81			
Mollusks	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8052	0.05	0.05	1.00	16.51	11.04	4
Mollusks	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-01	2.15	0.05	42.96			
Mollusks	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-06	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Mollusks	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-40	1.05	0.05	21.07			
Polychaetes	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8052	0.05	0.05	1.00	15.14	1.00	5
Polychaetes	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8060	¹	0.05				
Polychaetes	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8078	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Polychaetes	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-01	1.49	0.05	29.87			
Polychaetes	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-06	2.14	0.05	42.84			
Polychaetes	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-40	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Crustacea	South	Chlordanes	B13-8017	0.05	0.05	1.00	1.00	1.00	4
Crustacea	South	Chlordanes	B13-8020	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Crustacea	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-15	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Crustacea	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-21	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Mollusks	South	Chlordanes	B13-8029	0.05	0.05	1.00	2.40	1.00	4
Mollusks	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-15	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Mollusks	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-21	0.33	0.05	6.60			
Mollusks	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-22	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Polychaetes	South	Chlordanes	B13-8017	0.05	0.05	1.00	7.16	1.00	6
Polychaetes	South	Chlordanes	B13-8020	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Polychaetes	South	Chlordanes	B13-8029	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Polychaetes	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-15	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Polychaetes	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-21	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Polychaetes	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-22	1.90	0.05	37.94			
Crustacea	North	DDTs	B13-8109	21.48	0.05	429.60	183.73	136.40	5
Crustacea	North	DDTs	B13-8118	7.12	0.05	142.40			
Crustacea	North	DDTs	B13-8122	6.82	0.05	136.40			
Crustacea	North	DDTs	SWHB-26	4.08	0.05	81.66			
Crustacea	North	DDTs	SWHB-30	6.43	0.05	128.60			

Table B1. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	BSAF (ng/g ww) / (ng/g dw)	Mean	Median	Count
Mollusks	North	DDTs	SWHB-26	9.79	0.05	195.73	285.84	195.73	3
Mollusks	North	DDTs	SWHB-27	0.05	0.26	0.19			
Mollusks	North	DDTs	SWHB-30	33.08	0.05	661.60			
Polychaetes	North	DDTs	B13-8109	8.17	0.05	163.40	153.32	165.30	6
Polychaetes	North	DDTs	B13-8118	8.74	0.05	174.80			
Polychaetes	North	DDTs	B13-8122	8.36	0.05	167.20			
Polychaetes	North	DDTs	SWHB-26	11.22	0.05	224.37			
Polychaetes	North	DDTs	SWHB-27	10.72	0.26	41.22			
Polychaetes	North	DDTs	SWHB-30	7.44	0.05	148.90			
Crustacea	Central	DDTs	B13-8060	6.52	0.05	130.40	72.50	69.24	4
Crustacea	Central	DDTs	B13-8078	3.34	0.05	66.80			
Crustacea	Central	DDTs	SWHB-01	3.58	0.05	71.68			
Crustacea	Central	DDTs	SWHB-40	1.06	0.05	21.12			
Mollusks	Central	DDTs	B13-8052	0.05	0.05	1.00	68.90	63.69	4
Mollusks	Central	DDTs	SWHB-01	7.36	0.05	147.22			
Mollusks	Central	DDTs	SWHB-06	2.05	0.05	41.02			
Mollusks	Central	DDTs	SWHB-40	4.32	0.05	86.37			
Polychaetes	Central	DDTs	B13-8052	5.79	0.05	115.80	107.03	88.57	6
Polychaetes	Central	DDTs	B13-8060	4.65	0.05	93.00			
Polychaetes	Central	DDTs	B13-8078	4.14	0.05	82.80			
Polychaetes	Central	DDTs	SWHB-01	11.52	0.05	230.32			
Polychaetes	Central	DDTs	SWHB-06	1.81	0.05	36.12			
Polychaetes	Central	DDTs	SWHB-40	4.21	0.05	84.15			
Crustacea	South	DDTs	B13-8017	1.68	0.05	33.60	64.22	20.01	4
Crustacea	South	DDTs	B13-8020	10.82	0.05	216.40			
Crustacea	South	DDTs	SWHB-15	5.97	0.93	6.42			
Crustacea	South	DDTs	SWHB-21	0.05	0.11	0.45			
Mollusks	South	DDTs	B13-8029	1.42	0.05	28.40	22.53	23.20	4
Mollusks	South	DDTs	SWHB-15	3.29	0.93	3.54			
Mollusks	South	DDTs	SWHB-21	4.42	0.11	40.18			
Mollusks	South	DDTs	SWHB-22	0.90	0.05	18.00			
Polychaetes	South	DDTs	B13-8017	4.26	0.05	85.20	114.02	61.80	6
Polychaetes	South	DDTs	B13-8020	2.79	0.05	55.80			
Polychaetes	South	DDTs	B13-8029	21.53	0.05	430.60			
Polychaetes	South	DDTs	SWHB-15	5.55	0.93	5.97			
Polychaetes	South	DDTs	SWHB-21	4.26	0.11	38.73			
Polychaetes	South	DDTs	SWHB-22	3.39	0.05	67.80			
Crustacea	North	PBDEs	B13-8109	2.09	0.05	41.80	31.29	41.80	5
Crustacea	North	PBDEs	B13-8118	2.96	0.07	42.29			
Crustacea	North	PBDEs	B13-8122	2.25	0.05	45.00			
Crustacea	North	PBDEs	SWHB-26	0.70	0.05	14.02			
Crustacea	North	PBDEs	SWHB-30	2.40	0.18	13.33			
Mollusks	North	PBDEs	SWHB-26	0.86	0.05	17.18	15.33	17.18	3
Mollusks	North	PBDEs	SWHB-27	0.59	0.09	6.58			
Mollusks	North	PBDEs	SWHB-30	4.00	0.18	22.22			
Polychaetes	North	PBDEs	B13-8109	3.55	0.05	71.00	48.47	44.55	6
Polychaetes	North	PBDEs	B13-8118	6.17	0.07	88.14			
Polychaetes	North	PBDEs	B13-8122	3.05	0.05	61.00			
Polychaetes	North	PBDEs	SWHB-26	1.23	0.05	24.64			
Polychaetes	North	PBDEs	SWHB-27	1.61	0.09	17.94			
Polychaetes	North	PBDEs	SWHB-30	5.06	0.18	28.11			

Table B1. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	BSAF (ng/g ww) / (ng/g dw)	Mean	Median	Count
Crustacea	Central	PBDEs	B13-8060	3.30	0.05	66.00	39.08	35.43	4
Crustacea	Central	PBDEs	B13-8078	4.97	0.06	82.83			
Crustacea	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-01	6.36	1.31	4.85			
Crustacea	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-40	2.16	0.82	2.63			
Mollusks	Central	PBDEs	B13-8052	1.93	0.05	38.60	10.86	2.16	4
Mollusks	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-01	0.67	1.31	0.51			
Mollusks	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-06	0.39	0.14	2.78			
Mollusks	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-40	1.26	0.82	1.53			
Polychaetes	Central	PBDEs	B13-8052	8.16	0.05	163.20	87.61	74.09	6
Polychaetes	Central	PBDEs	B13-8060	10.51	0.05	210.20			
Polychaetes	Central	PBDEs	B13-8078	8.08	0.06	134.67			
Polychaetes	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-01	2.14	1.31	1.63			
Polychaetes	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-06	1.89	0.14	13.52			
Polychaetes	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-40	1.99	0.82	2.43			
Crustacea	South	PBDEs	B13-8017	9.19	2.44	3.77	147.29	2.05	4
Crustacea	South	PBDEs	B13-8020	8.85	27.02	0.33			
Crustacea	South	PBDEs	SWHB-15	0.05	0.84	0.06			
Crustacea	South	PBDEs	SWHB-21	99.45	0.17	585.00			
Mollusks	South	PBDEs	B13-8029	3.26	7.42	0.44	2.69	0.37	4
Mollusks	South	PBDEs	SWHB-15	0.16	0.84	0.20			
Mollusks	South	PBDEs	SWHB-21	0.05	0.17	0.29			
Mollusks	South	PBDEs	SWHB-22	2.17	0.22	9.85			
Polychaetes	South	PBDEs	B13-8017	21.68	2.44	8.89	8.76	6.20	6
Polychaetes	South	PBDEs	B13-8020	11.46	27.02	0.42			
Polychaetes	South	PBDEs	B13-8029	11.83	7.42	1.59			
Polychaetes	South	PBDEs	SWHB-15	2.96	0.84	3.52			
Polychaetes	South	PBDEs	SWHB-21	4.17	0.17	24.53			
Polychaetes	South	PBDEs	SWHB-22	2.99	0.22	13.58			
Crustacea	North	PCBs	B13-8109	151.47	3.66	41.39	23.86	20.41	5
Crustacea	North	PCBs	B13-8118	161.57	9.34	17.30			
Crustacea	North	PCBs	B13-8122	168.59	8.26	20.41			
Crustacea	North	PCBs	SWHB-26	79.30	7.11	11.15			
Crustacea	North	PCBs	SWHB-30	16.84	0.58	29.03			
Mollusks	North	PCBs	SWHB-26	64.19	7.11	9.03	14.28	9.03	3
Mollusks	North	PCBs	SWHB-27	42.47	36.48	1.16			
Mollusks	North	PCBs	SWHB-30	18.94	0.58	32.66			
Polychaetes	North	PCBs	B13-8109	132.48	3.66	36.20	23.53	18.24	6
Polychaetes	North	PCBs	B13-8118	166.71	9.34	17.85			
Polychaetes	North	PCBs	B13-8122	153.95	8.26	18.64			
Polychaetes	North	PCBs	SWHB-26	110.36	7.11	15.52			
Polychaetes	North	PCBs	SWHB-27	138.02	36.48	3.78			
Polychaetes	North	PCBs	SWHB-30	28.52	0.58	49.17			
Crustacea	Central	PCBs	B13-8060	69.21	5.84	11.85	16.74	16.89	4
Crustacea	Central	PCBs	B13-8078	57.33	8.71	6.58			
Crustacea	Central	PCBs	SWHB-01	150.87	5.67	26.61			
Crustacea	Central	PCBs	SWHB-40	92.75	4.23	21.93			
Mollusks	Central	PCBs	B13-8052	10.18	3.07	3.32	16.32	16.05	4
Mollusks	Central	PCBs	SWHB-01	169.42	5.67	29.88			
Mollusks	Central	PCBs	SWHB-06	21.14	2.62	8.07			
Mollusks	Central	PCBs	SWHB-40	101.63	4.23	24.03			

Table B1. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	BSAF (ng/g ww) / (ng/g dw)	Mean	Median	Count
Polychaetes	Central	PCBs	B13-8052	113.90	3.07	37.10	38.11	41.29	6
Polychaetes	Central	PCBs	B13-8060	157.48	5.84	26.97			
Polychaetes	Central	PCBs	B13-8078	111.85	8.71	12.84			
Polychaetes	Central	PCBs	SWHB-01	283.07	5.67	49.92			
Polychaetes	Central	PCBs	SWHB-06	147.57	2.62	56.33			
Polychaetes	Central	PCBs	SWHB-40	192.39	4.23	45.48			
Crustacea	South	PCBs	B13-8017	28.80	4.96	5.81	21.79	11.48	4
Crustacea	South	PCBs	B13-8020	57.94	11.78	4.92			
Crustacea	South	PCBs	SWHB-15	31.03	1.81	17.14			
Crustacea	South	PCBs	SWHB-21	123.31	2.08	59.28			
Mollusks	South	PCBs	B13-8029	9.71	6.57	1.48	3.92	1.49	4
Mollusks	South	PCBs	SWHB-15	2.70	1.81	1.49			
Mollusks	South	PCBs	SWHB-21	23.35	2.08	11.23			
Mollusks	South	PCBs	SWHB-22	15.29	10.36	1.48			
Polychaetes	South	PCBs	B13-8017	80.70	4.96	16.27	22.89	16.69	6
Polychaetes	South	PCBs	B13-8020	28.43	11.78	2.41			
Polychaetes	South	PCBs	B13-8029	112.39	6.57	17.11			
Polychaetes	South	PCBs	SWHB-15	48.26	1.81	26.66			
Polychaetes	South	PCBs	SWHB-21	146.21	2.08	70.29			
Polychaetes	South	PCBs	SWHB-22	47.44	10.36	4.58			

¹ Tissue result removed due to apparent outlier

Table B2. BSAF summary for fish.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	BSAF (ng/g ww) / (ng/g dw)	Mean	Median	Count
Barred sand bass	North	Chlordanes	B13-8109	3.02	0.05	60.40	52.85	55.20	4
Barred sand bass	North	Chlordanes	B13-8118	2.03	0.05	40.60			
Barred sand bass	North	Chlordanes	B13-8118	2.77	0.05	55.40			
Barred sand bass	North	Chlordanes	B13-8122	2.75	0.05	55.00			
Black perch	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-26	5.83	0.05	116.56	64.06	64.06	2
Black perch	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-30	0.58	0.05	11.55			
California halibut	North	Chlordanes	B13-8109	0.69	0.05	13.80	21.78	17.60	7
California halibut	North	Chlordanes	B13-8118	0.74	0.05	14.80			
California halibut	North	Chlordanes	B13-8118	0.89	0.05	17.80			
California halibut	North	Chlordanes	B13-8122	0.88	0.05	17.60			
California halibut	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-26	1.72	0.05	34.40			
California halibut	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-27	2.65	0.05	53.06			
California halibut	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-30	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Shiner perch	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-26	0.03	0.05	0.55	71.09	57.57	3
Shiner perch	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-26	2.88	0.05	57.57			
Shiner perch	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-27	7.76	0.05	155.15			
Spotted sand bass	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-26	4.85	0.05	97.02	64.65	62.29	3
Spotted sand bass	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-27	3.11	0.05	62.29			
Spotted sand bass	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-30	1.73	0.05	34.64			
Topsmelt	North	Chlordanes	SDN1	3.43	0.44	7.83	4.96	4.22	3
Topsmelt	North	Chlordanes	SDN2	1.24	0.44	2.83			
Topsmelt	North	Chlordanes	SDN3	1.85	0.44	4.22			
Barred sand bass	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8052	0.63	0.05	12.60	34.00	34.00	2
Barred sand bass	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8060	2.77	0.05	55.40			
California halibut	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8052	1.59	0.05	31.80	25.42	23.15	7
California halibut	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8060	1.34	0.05	26.80			
California halibut	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8078	0.71	0.05	14.20			
California halibut	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-01	1.16	0.05	23.15			
California halibut	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-06	0.51	0.05	10.17			
California halibut	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-06	0.51	0.05	10.29			
California halibut	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-40	3.08	0.05	61.56			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8052	6.29	0.05	125.80	80.59	90.10	6
Deepbody anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8052	6.65	0.05	133.00			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8052	6.47	0.05	129.40			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8060	2.72	0.05	54.40			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8060	2.27	0.05	45.40			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8060	2.54	0.05	50.80			
Shiner perch	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-01	1.27	0.05	25.30	50.99	50.99	2
Shiner perch	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-40	3.83	0.05	76.68			
Slough anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8052	1.00	0.05	20.00	21.42	20.00	8
Slough anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8052	1.16	0.05	23.20			
Slough anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8052	0.85	0.05	17.00			
Slough anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8060	2.52	0.05	50.40			
Slough anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8060	1.00	0.05	20.00			
Slough anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8060	1.09	0.05	21.80			
Slough anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	SDC1	1.24	0.07	18.26			
Slough anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	SDC3	0.05	0.07	0.74			

Table B2. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	BSAF (ng/g ww) / (ng/g dw)	Mean	Median	Count
Spotted sand bass	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8060	3.36	0.05	67.20	51.38	58.16	5
Spotted sand bass	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8078	1.28	0.05	25.60			
Spotted sand bass	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-01	2.91	0.05	58.16			
Spotted sand bass	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-06	3.95	0.05	79.01			
Spotted sand bass	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-40	1.35	0.05	26.92			
Topsmelt	Central	Chlordanes	SDC1	0.54	0.07	7.95	12.91	14.43	3
Topsmelt	Central	Chlordanes	SDC2	0.98	0.07	14.43			
Topsmelt	Central	Chlordanes	SDC3	1.11	0.07	16.35			
Arrow goby	South	Chlordanes	SDS2/3	0.05	0.05	1.00	1.00	1.00	1
Barred sand bass	South	Chlordanes	B13-8017	0.24	0.05	4.80	14.80	4.80	3
Barred sand bass	South	Chlordanes	B13-8020	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Barred sand bass	South	Chlordanes	B13-8029	1.93	0.05	38.60			
California halibut	South	Chlordanes	B13-8020	0.90	0.05	18.00	19.21	16.78	6
California halibut	South	Chlordanes	B13-8029	1.99	0.05	39.80			
California halibut	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-15	0.29	0.05	5.89			
California halibut	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-21	1.15	0.05	22.97			
California halibut	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-21	0.65	0.05	13.06			
California halibut	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-22	0.78	0.05	15.56			
California killifish	South	Chlordanes	SDS2	0.05	0.05	1.00	1.00	1.00	2
California killifish	South	Chlordanes	SDS3	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Deepbody anchovy	South	Chlordanes	B13-8017	0.76	0.05	15.20	17.36	15.20	5
Deepbody anchovy	South	Chlordanes	B13-8020	0.26	0.05	5.20			
Deepbody anchovy	South	Chlordanes	B13-8020	1.02	0.05	20.40			
Deepbody anchovy	South	Chlordanes	B13-8020	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Deepbody anchovy	South	Chlordanes	B13-8029	2.25	0.05	45.00			
Northern anchovy	South	Chlordanes	SDS2	0.05	0.05	1.00	1.00	1.00	2
Northern anchovy	South	Chlordanes	SDS3	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Round stingray	South	Chlordanes	B13-8017	10.21	0.05	204.20	204.20	204.20	1
Shiner perch	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-22	0.14	0.05	2.80	2.80	2.80	1
Slough anchovy	South	Chlordanes	B13-8020	0.05	0.05	1.00	36.32	36.32	2
Slough anchovy	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-15	3.58	0.05	71.64			
Spotted sand bass	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-15	1.85	0.05	37.05	52.41	52.65	3
Spotted sand bass	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-21	3.38	0.05	67.53			
Spotted sand bass	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-22	2.63	0.05	52.65			
Topsmelt	South	Chlordanes	SDS1	1.50	0.05	30.00	14.20	11.60	3
Topsmelt	South	Chlordanes	SDS2	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Topsmelt	South	Chlordanes	SDS3	0.58	0.05	11.60			
Barred sand bass	North	DDTs	B13-8109	18.71	0.05	374.20	419.35	322.40	4
Barred sand bass	North	DDTs	B13-8118	13.53	0.05	270.60			
Barred sand bass	North	DDTs	B13-8118	40.32	0.05	806.40			
Barred sand bass	North	DDTs	B13-8122	11.31	0.05	226.20			
Black perch	North	DDTs	SWHB-26	20.11	0.05	402.22	265.03	265.03	2
Black perch	North	DDTs	SWHB-30	6.39	0.05	127.84			
California halibut	North	DDTs	B13-8109	8.16	0.05	163.20	248.28	210.20	7
California halibut	North	DDTs	B13-8118	10.51	0.05	210.20			
California halibut	North	DDTs	B13-8118	13.25	0.05	265.00			
California halibut	North	DDTs	B13-8122	37.71	0.05	754.20			
California halibut	North	DDTs	SWHB-26	12.25	0.05	245.06			
California halibut	North	DDTs	SWHB-27	12.98	0.26	49.91			
California halibut	North	DDTs	SWHB-30	2.52	0.05	50.37			

Table B2. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	BSAF (ng/g ww) / (ng/g dw)	Mean	Median	Count
Shiner perch	North	DDTs	SWHB-26	4.08	0.05	81.58	194.57	84.82	3
Shiner perch	North	DDTs	SWHB-26	20.87	0.05	417.32			
Shiner perch	North	DDTs	SWHB-27	22.05	0.26	84.82			
Spotted sand bass	North	DDTs	SWHB-26	12.72	0.05	254.42	204.64	254.42	3
Spotted sand bass	North	DDTs	SWHB-27	10.20	0.26	39.25			
Spotted sand bass	North	DDTs	SWHB-30	16.01	0.05	320.26			
Topsmelt	North	DDTs	SDN1	6.45	0.16	41.39	57.09	54.87	3
Topsmelt	North	DDTs	SDN2	8.55	0.16	54.87			
Topsmelt	North	DDTs	SDN3	11.69	0.16	75.02			
Barred sand bass	Central	DDTs	B13-8052	4.82	0.05	96.40	258.80	258.80	2
Barred sand bass	Central	DDTs	B13-8060	21.06	0.05	421.20			
California halibut	Central	DDTs	B13-8052	12.69	0.05	253.80	186.25	186.20	7
California halibut	Central	DDTs	B13-8060	10.42	0.05	208.40			
California halibut	Central	DDTs	B13-8078	9.31	0.05	186.20			
California halibut	Central	DDTs	SWHB-01	8.39	0.05	167.82			
California halibut	Central	DDTs	SWHB-06	6.08	0.05	121.51			
California halibut	Central	DDTs	SWHB-06	4.82	0.05	96.47			
California halibut	Central	DDTs	SWHB-40	13.48	0.05	269.59			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	DDTs	B13-8052	38.72	0.05	774.40	601.97	575.10	6
Deepbody anchovy	Central	DDTs	B13-8052	46.36	0.05	927.20			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	DDTs	B13-8052	42.95	0.05	859.00			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	DDTs	B13-8060	17.04	0.05	340.80			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	DDTs	B13-8060	16.73	0.05	334.60			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	DDTs	B13-8060	18.79	0.05	375.80			
Shiner perch	Central	DDTs	SWHB-01	12.48	0.05	249.68	287.52	287.52	2
Shiner perch	Central	DDTs	SWHB-40	16.27	0.05	325.36			
Slough anchovy	Central	DDTs	B13-8052	8.67	0.05	173.40	198.06	180.60	8
Slough anchovy	Central	DDTs	B13-8052	8.03	0.05	160.60			
Slough anchovy	Central	DDTs	B13-8052	8.32	0.05	166.40			
Slough anchovy	Central	DDTs	B13-8060	14.89	0.05	297.80			
Slough anchovy	Central	DDTs	B13-8060	12.33	0.05	246.60			
Slough anchovy	Central	DDTs	B13-8060	11.16	0.05	223.20			
Slough anchovy	Central	DDTs	SDC1	12.75	0.07	187.79			
Slough anchovy	Central	DDTs	SDC3	8.74	0.07	128.73			
Spotted sand bass	Central	DDTs	B13-8060	10.06	0.05	201.20	173.42	201.20	5
Spotted sand bass	Central	DDTs	B13-8078	5.62	0.05	112.40			
Spotted sand bass	Central	DDTs	SWHB-01	10.60	0.05	211.94			
Spotted sand bass	Central	DDTs	SWHB-06	13.22	0.05	264.47			
Spotted sand bass	Central	DDTs	SWHB-40	3.85	0.05	77.07			
Topsmelt	Central	DDTs	SDC1	10.44	0.07	153.77	96.62	74.53	3
Topsmelt	Central	DDTs	SDC2	4.18	0.07	61.57			
Topsmelt	Central	DDTs	SDC3	5.06	0.07	74.53			
Arrow goby	South	DDTs	SDS2/3	0.05	0.20	0.26	0.26	0.26	1
Barred sand bass	South	DDTs	B13-8017	13.58	0.05	271.60	234.20	271.60	3
Barred sand bass	South	DDTs	B13-8020	7.45	0.05	149.00			
Barred sand bass	South	DDTs	B13-8029	14.10	0.05	282.00			

Table B2. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	BSAF (ng/g ww) / (ng/g dw)	Mean	Median	Count
California halibut	South	DDTs	B13-8020	11.98	0.05	239.60	157.13	140.46	6
California halibut	South	DDTs	B13-8029	15.56	0.05	311.20			
California halibut	South	DDTs	SWHB-15	12.22	0.93	13.14			
California halibut	South	DDTs	SWHB-21	11.88	0.11	108.03			
California halibut	South	DDTs	SWHB-21	10.78	0.11	97.96			
California halibut	South	DDTs	SWHB-22	8.64	0.05	172.88			
California killifish	South	DDTs	SDS2	1.81	0.20	9.25	33.34	33.34	2
California killifish	South	DDTs	SDS3	11.24	0.20	57.43			
Deepbody anchovy	South	DDTs	B13-8017	6.41	0.05	128.20	191.16	173.40	5
Deepbody anchovy	South	DDTs	B13-8020	8.67	0.05	173.40			
Deepbody anchovy	South	DDTs	B13-8020	10.72	0.05	214.40			
Deepbody anchovy	South	DDTs	B13-8020	6.56	0.05	131.20			
Deepbody anchovy	South	DDTs	B13-8029	15.43	0.05	308.60			
Deepbody anchovy	South	DDTs	B13-8029	15.43	0.05	308.60			
Northern anchovy	South	DDTs	SDS2	9.61	0.20	49.10	45.42	45.42	2
Northern anchovy	South	DDTs	SDS3	8.17	0.20	41.74			
Round stingray	South	DDTs	B13-8017	0.55	0.05	11.00	11.00	11.00	1
Shiner perch	South	DDTs	SWHB-22	11.33	0.05	226.68	226.68	226.68	1
Slough anchovy	South	DDTs	B13-8020	6.19	0.05	123.80	78.50	78.50	2
Slough anchovy	South	DDTs	SWHB-15	30.88	0.93	33.21			
Spotted sand bass	South	DDTs	SWHB-15	15.80	0.93	16.99	109.00	90.35	3
Spotted sand bass	South	DDTs	SWHB-21	9.94	0.11	90.35			
Spotted sand bass	South	DDTs	SWHB-22	10.98	0.05	219.65			
Topsmelt	South	DDTs	SDS1	7.76	0.20	39.65	25.96	19.36	3
Topsmelt	South	DDTs	SDS2	3.69	0.20	18.85			
Topsmelt	South	DDTs	SDS3	3.79	0.20	19.36			
Barred sand bass	North	PBDEs	B13-8109	2.04	0.05	40.80	73.73	49.40	4
Barred sand bass	North	PBDEs	B13-8118	2.29	0.07	32.71			
Barred sand bass	North	PBDEs	B13-8118	4.06	0.07	58.00			
Barred sand bass	North	PBDEs	B13-8122	8.17	0.05	163.40			
Black perch	North	PBDEs	SWHB-26	7.19	0.05	143.77	79.83	79.83	2
Black perch	North	PBDEs	SWHB-30	2.86	0.18	15.89			
California halibut	North	PBDEs	B13-8109	0.99	0.05	19.80	22.13	19.80	7
California halibut	North	PBDEs	B13-8118	1.31	0.07	18.71			
California halibut	North	PBDEs	B13-8118	1.37	0.07	19.57			
California halibut	North	PBDEs	B13-8122	1.81	0.05	36.20			
California halibut	North	PBDEs	SWHB-26	1.48	0.05	29.68			
California halibut	North	PBDEs	SWHB-27	2.38	0.09	26.44			
California halibut	North	PBDEs	SWHB-30	0.81	0.18	4.51			
California halibut	North	PBDEs	SWHB-30	0.81	0.18	4.51			
Shiner perch	North	PBDEs	SWHB-26	12.51	0.05	250.11	134.35	87.16	3
Shiner perch	North	PBDEs	SWHB-26	3.29	0.05	65.78			
Shiner perch	North	PBDEs	SWHB-27	7.84	0.09	87.16			
Spotted sand bass	North	PBDEs	SWHB-26	1.25	0.05	25.02	18.60	18.96	3
Spotted sand bass	North	PBDEs	SWHB-27	1.06	0.09	11.83			
Spotted sand bass	North	PBDEs	SWHB-30	3.41	0.18	18.96			
Topsmelt	North	PBDEs	SDN1	5.30	1.96	2.70	2.82	2.70	3
Topsmelt	North	PBDEs	SDN2	3.67	1.96	1.87			
Topsmelt	North	PBDEs	SDN3	7.63	1.96	3.89			
Barred sand bass	Central	PBDEs	B13-8052	7.02	0.05	140.40	99.40	99.40	2
Barred sand bass	Central	PBDEs	B13-8060	2.92	0.05	58.40			

Table B2. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	BSAF (ng/g ww) / (ng/g dw)	Mean	Median	Count
California halibut	Central	PBDEs	B13-8052	3.84	0.05	76.80	24.99	5.23	7
California halibut	Central	PBDEs	B13-8060	2.72	0.05	54.40			
California halibut	Central	PBDEs	B13-8078	1.92	0.06	32.00			
California halibut	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-01	1.47	1.31	1.12			
California halibut	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-06	0.46	0.14	3.32			
California halibut	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-06	0.73	0.14	5.23			
California halibut	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-40	1.70	0.82	2.07			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	PBDEs	B13-8052	0.06	0.05	1.20	1.87	1.30	6
Deepbody anchovy	Central	PBDEs	B13-8052	0.07	0.05	1.40			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	PBDEs	B13-8052	0.14	0.05	2.80			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	PBDEs	B13-8060	0.19	0.05	3.80			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	PBDEs	B13-8060	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	PBDEs	B13-8060	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Shiner perch	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-01	11.77	1.31	8.99			
Shiner perch	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-40	8.81	0.82	10.74			
Slough anchovy	Central	PBDEs	B13-8052	0.08	0.05	1.60	3.71	1.31	8
Slough anchovy	Central	PBDEs	B13-8052	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Slough anchovy	Central	PBDEs	B13-8052	0.58	0.05	11.60			
Slough anchovy	Central	PBDEs	B13-8060	0.05	0.05	1.00			
Slough anchovy	Central	PBDEs	B13-8060	0.23	0.05	4.60			
Slough anchovy	Central	PBDEs	B13-8060	0.40	0.05	8.00			
Slough anchovy	Central	PBDEs	SDC1	3.36	3.31	1.01			
Slough anchovy	Central	PBDEs	SDC3	2.87	3.31	0.87			
Spotted sand bass	Central	PBDEs	B13-8060	1.79	0.05	35.80			
Spotted sand bass	Central	PBDEs	B13-8078	0.14	0.06	2.33			
Spotted sand bass	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-01	0.55	1.31	0.42			
Spotted sand bass	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-06	1.26	0.14	9.02			
Spotted sand bass	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-40	0.22	0.82	0.27			
Topsmelt	Central	PBDEs	SDC1	15.20	3.31	4.59	1.91	0.70	3
Topsmelt	Central	PBDEs	SDC2	2.31	3.31	0.70			
Topsmelt	Central	PBDEs	SDC3	1.49	3.31	0.45			
Arrow goby	South	PBDEs	SDS2/3	19.53	2.19	8.91	8.91	8.91	1
Barred sand bass	South	PBDEs	B13-8017	1.51	2.44	0.62	0.32	0.24	3
Barred sand bass	South	PBDEs	B13-8020	2.41	27.02	0.09			
Barred sand bass	South	PBDEs	B13-8029	1.79	7.42	0.24			
California halibut	South	PBDEs	B13-8020	4.19	27.02	0.16	3.66	1.41	6
California halibut	South	PBDEs	B13-8029	4.08	7.42	0.55			
California halibut	South	PBDEs	SWHB-15	0.67	0.84	0.79			
California halibut	South	PBDEs	SWHB-21	1.23	0.17	7.25			
California halibut	South	PBDEs	SWHB-21	1.90	0.17	11.16			
California halibut	South	PBDEs	SWHB-22	0.45	0.22	2.03			
California killifish	South	PBDEs	SDS2	4.36	2.19	1.99			
California killifish	South	PBDEs	SDS3	0.92	2.19	0.42			
Deepbody anchovy	South	PBDEs	B13-8017	0.05	2.44	0.02	0.01	0.01	5
Deepbody anchovy	South	PBDEs	B13-8020	0.16	27.02	0.01			
Deepbody anchovy	South	PBDEs	B13-8020	0.28	27.02	0.01			
Deepbody anchovy	South	PBDEs	B13-8020	0.05	27.02	0.00			
Deepbody anchovy	South	PBDEs	B13-8020	0.05	27.02	0.00			
Deepbody anchovy	South	PBDEs	B13-8029	0.05	7.42	0.01			

Table B2. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	BSAF (ng/g ww) / (ng/g dw)	Mean	Median	Count
Northern anchovy	South	PBDEs	SDS2	0.05	2.19	0.02	3.93	3.93	2
Northern anchovy	South	PBDEs	SDS3	17.16	2.19	7.83			
Round stingray	South	PBDEs	B13-8017	10.08	2.44	4.13	4.13	4.13	1
Shiner perch	South	PBDEs	SWHB-22	1.87	0.22	8.49	8.49	8.49	1
Slough anchovy	South	PBDEs	B13-8020	0.56	27.02	0.02	1.13	1.13	2
Slough anchovy	South	PBDEs	SWHB-15	1.88	0.84	2.24			
Spotted sand bass	South	PBDEs	SWHB-15	1.72	0.84	2.04	3.02	2.04	3
Spotted sand bass	South	PBDEs	SWHB-21	0.86	0.17	5.06			
Spotted sand bass	South	PBDEs	SWHB-22	0.43	0.22	1.95			
Topsmelt	South	PBDEs	SDS1	10.93	2.19	4.99	4.77	4.99	3
Topsmelt	South	PBDEs	SDS2	16.88	2.19	7.70			
Topsmelt	South	PBDEs	SDS3	3.53	2.19	1.61			
Barred sand bass	North	PCBs	B13-8109	246.27	3.66	67.29	35.73	26.63	4
Barred sand bass	North	PCBs	B13-8118	208.84	9.34	22.36			
Barred sand bass	North	PCBs	B13-8118	223.53	9.34	23.93			
Barred sand bass	North	PCBs	B13-8122	242.22	8.26	29.32			
Black perch	North	PCBs	SWHB-26	431.51	7.11	60.69	71.06	71.06	2
Black perch	North	PCBs	SWHB-30	47.23	0.58	81.43			
California halibut	North	PCBs	B13-8109	123.94	3.66	33.86	25.54	22.62	7
California halibut	North	PCBs	B13-8118	141.22	9.34	15.12			
California halibut	North	PCBs	B13-8118	193.10	9.34	20.67			
California halibut	North	PCBs	B13-8122	186.84	8.26	22.62			
California halibut	North	PCBs	SWHB-26	259.45	7.11	36.49			
California halibut	North	PCBs	SWHB-27	209.29	36.48	5.74			
California halibut	North	PCBs	SWHB-30	25.69	0.58	44.29			
Shiner perch	North	PCBs	SWHB-26	29.95	7.11	4.21	11.05	10.64	3
Shiner perch	North	PCBs	SWHB-26	130.05	7.11	18.29			
Shiner perch	North	PCBs	SWHB-27	388.14	36.48	10.64			
Spotted sand bass	North	PCBs	SWHB-26	303.61	7.11	42.70	102.89	42.70	3
Spotted sand bass	North	PCBs	SWHB-27	418.37	36.48	11.47			
Spotted sand bass	North	PCBs	SWHB-30	147.61	0.58	254.49			
Topsmelt	North	PCBs	SDN1	209.93	21.03	9.98	6.95	6.17	3
Topsmelt	North	PCBs	SDN2	129.81	21.03	6.17			
Topsmelt	North	PCBs	SDN3	98.53	21.03	4.68			
Barred sand bass	Central	PCBs	B13-8052	117.92	3.07	38.41	50.79	50.79	2
Barred sand bass	Central	PCBs	B13-8060	368.87	5.84	63.16			
California halibut	Central	PCBs	B13-8052	298.47	3.07	97.22	55.18	50.05	7
California halibut	Central	PCBs	B13-8060	258.18	5.84	44.21			
California halibut	Central	PCBs	B13-8078	165.19	8.71	18.97			
California halibut	Central	PCBs	SWHB-01	142.19	5.67	25.08			
California halibut	Central	PCBs	SWHB-06	131.14	2.62	50.05			
California halibut	Central	PCBs	SWHB-06	172.80	2.62	65.95			
California halibut	Central	PCBs	SWHB-40	358.71	4.23	84.80			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	PCBs	B13-8052	458.46	3.07	149.34	96.37	96.68	6
Deepbody anchovy	Central	PCBs	B13-8052	457.99	3.07	149.18			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	PCBs	B13-8052	456.16	3.07	148.59			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	PCBs	B13-8060	261.10	5.84	44.71			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	PCBs	B13-8060	243.18	5.84	41.64			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	PCBs	B13-8060	261.48	5.84	44.77			

Table B2. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	BSAF (ng/g ww) / (ng/g dw)	Mean	Median	Count
Shiner perch	Central	PCBs	SWHB-01	94.82	5.67	16.72	46.57	46.57	2
Shiner perch	Central	PCBs	SWHB-40	323.26	4.23	76.42			
Slough anchovy	Central	PCBs	B13-8052	227.82	3.07	74.21	55.17	47.54	8
Slough anchovy	Central	PCBs	B13-8052	224.80	3.07	73.22			
Slough anchovy	Central	PCBs	B13-8052	217.52	3.07	70.85			
Slough anchovy	Central	PCBs	B13-8060	273.97	5.84	46.91			
Slough anchovy	Central	PCBs	B13-8060	243.06	5.84	41.62			
Slough anchovy	Central	PCBs	B13-8060	281.29	5.84	48.17			
Slough anchovy	Central	PCBs	SDC1	290.55	7.09	40.96			
Slough anchovy	Central	PCBs	SDC3	322.02	7.09	45.40			
Spotted sand bass	Central	PCBs	B13-8060	342.16	5.84	58.59	71.22	58.59	5
Spotted sand bass	Central	PCBs	B13-8078	148.49	8.71	17.05			
Spotted sand bass	Central	PCBs	SWHB-01	570.60	5.67	100.64			
Spotted sand bass	Central	PCBs	SWHB-06	358.84	2.62	136.96			
Spotted sand bass	Central	PCBs	SWHB-40	181.38	4.23	42.88			
Topsmelt	Central	PCBs	SDC1	251.15	7.09	35.41	27.94	27.56	3
Topsmelt	Central	PCBs	SDC2	147.89	7.09	20.85			
Topsmelt	Central	PCBs	SDC3	195.48	7.09	27.56			
Arrow goby	South	PCBs	SDS2/3	98.30	4.95	19.85	19.85	19.85	1
Barred sand bass	South	PCBs	B13-8017	100.97	4.96	20.36	15.72	19.89	3
Barred sand bass	South	PCBs	B13-8020	81.38	11.78	6.91			
Barred sand bass	South	PCBs	B13-8029	130.66	6.57	19.89			
California halibut	South	PCBs	B13-8020	161.26	11.78	13.69	43.43	31.09	6
California halibut	South	PCBs	B13-8029	161.88	6.57	24.64			
California halibut	South	PCBs	SWHB-15	67.95	1.81	37.54			
California halibut	South	PCBs	SWHB-21	171.49	2.08	82.45			
California halibut	South	PCBs	SWHB-21	190.68	2.08	91.67			
California halibut	South	PCBs	SWHB-22	109.47	10.36	10.57			
California killifish	South	PCBs	SDS2	38.40	4.95	7.76	13.74	13.74	2
California killifish	South	PCBs	SDS3	97.67	4.95	19.73			
Deepbody anchovy	South	PCBs	B13-8017	90.55	4.96	18.26	17.15	17.07	5
Deepbody anchovy	South	PCBs	B13-8020	175.62	11.78	14.91			
Deepbody anchovy	South	PCBs	B13-8020	201.03	11.78	17.07			
Deepbody anchovy	South	PCBs	B13-8020	110.98	11.78	9.42			
Deepbody anchovy	South	PCBs	B13-8029	171.62	6.57	26.12			
Northern anchovy	South	PCBs	SDS2	208.47	4.95	42.10	44.35	44.35	2
Northern anchovy	South	PCBs	SDS3	230.72	4.95	46.60			
Round stingray	South	PCBs	B13-8017	418.67	4.96	84.41	84.41	84.41	1
Shiner perch	South	PCBs	SWHB-22	85.51	10.36	8.25	8.25	8.25	1
Slough anchovy	South	PCBs	B13-8020	202.72	11.78	17.21	63.07	63.07	2
Slough anchovy	South	PCBs	SWHB-15	197.15	1.81	108.92			
Spotted sand bass	South	PCBs	SWHB-15	259.54	1.81	143.39	100.00	141.71	3
Spotted sand bass	South	PCBs	SWHB-21	294.75	2.08	141.71			
Spotted sand bass	South	PCBs	SWHB-22	154.45	10.36	14.91			
Topsmelt	South	PCBs	SDS1	134.29	4.95	27.12	19.92	18.63	3
Topsmelt	South	PCBs	SDS2	69.34	4.95	14.00			
Topsmelt	South	PCBs	SDS3	92.24	4.95	18.63			

Table B3. BSAF summary for seabird eggs.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g fw)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	BSAF (ng/g fw) / (ng/g dw)	Mean	Median	Count
California least tern	North	Chlordanes	Lindbergh Field	5.12	0.44	11.70	13.72	11.70	5
California least tern	North	Chlordanes	Lindbergh Field	4.50	0.44	10.28			
California least tern	North	Chlordanes	Lindbergh Field	8.27	0.44	18.88			
California least tern	North	Chlordanes	Lindbergh Field	4.93	0.44	11.26			
California least tern	North	Chlordanes	Lindbergh Field	7.22	0.44	16.48			
California least tern	South	Chlordanes	Chula Vista Nature Reserve	4.12	0.05	82.37	110.33	82.37	13
California least tern	South	Chlordanes	Chula Vista Nature Reserve	6.41	0.05	128.28			
California least tern	South	Chlordanes	Chula Vista Nature Reserve	8.36	0.05	167.21			
California least tern	South	Chlordanes	Chula Vista Nature Reserve	5.21	0.05	104.23			
California least tern	South	Chlordanes	D-Street fill	2.91	0.05	58.18			
California least tern	South	Chlordanes	D-Street fill	3.38	0.05	67.54			
California least tern	South	Chlordanes	D-Street fill	3.54	0.05	70.72			
California least tern	South	Chlordanes	D-Street fill	2.04	0.05	40.78			
California least tern	South	Chlordanes	D-Street fill	7.08	0.05	141.57			
California least tern	South	Chlordanes	D-Street fill	2.08	0.05	41.67			
California least tern	South	Chlordanes	Salt Works	3.06	0.05	61.11			
California least tern	South	Chlordanes	Salt Works	6.02	0.05	120.47			
California least tern	South	Chlordanes	Salt Works	17.51	0.05	350.24			
Caspian tern	South	Chlordanes	Salt Works	6.72	0.05	134.49	190.52	150.21	10
Caspian tern	South	Chlordanes	Salt Works	24.64	0.05	492.77			
Caspian tern	South	Chlordanes	Salt Works	14.32	0.05	286.39			
Caspian tern	South	Chlordanes	Salt Works	12.25	0.05	244.91			
Caspian tern	South	Chlordanes	Salt Works	8.30	0.05	165.93			
Caspian tern	South	Chlordanes	Salt Works	5.21	0.05	104.12			
Caspian tern	South	Chlordanes	Salt Works	3.58	0.05	71.59			
Caspian tern	South	Chlordanes	Salt Works	11.53	0.05	230.51			
Caspian tern	South	Chlordanes	Salt Works	2.14	0.05	42.79			
Caspian tern	South	Chlordanes	Salt Works	6.59	0.05	131.74			

Table B3. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g fw)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	BSAF (ng/g fw) / (ng/g dw)	Mean	Median	Count
Double-crested cormorant	South	Chlordanes	Salt Works	2.89	0.05	57.78	27.41	17.61	8
Double-crested cormorant	South	Chlordanes	Salt Works	0.04	0.05	0.83			
Double-crested cormorant	South	Chlordanes	Salt Works	1.20	0.05	23.90			
Double-crested cormorant	South	Chlordanes	Salt Works	0.57	0.05	11.32			
Double-crested cormorant	South	Chlordanes	Salt Works	0.04	0.05	0.88			
Double-crested cormorant	South	Chlordanes	Salt Works	0.05	0.05	0.97			
Double-crested cormorant	South	Chlordanes	Salt Works	3.49	0.05	69.76			
Double-crested cormorant	South	Chlordanes	Salt Works	2.69	0.05	53.85			
Western gull	North	Chlordanes	NAS North Isl	2.92	0.44	6.66	3.84	2.88	8
Western gull	North	Chlordanes	NAS North Isl	0.34	0.44	0.77			
Western gull	North	Chlordanes	NAS North Isl	3.08	0.44	7.04			
Western gull	North	Chlordanes	NAS North Isl	0.34	0.44	0.78			
Western gull	North	Chlordanes	NAS North Isl	0.59	0.44	1.34			
Western gull	North	Chlordanes	NAS North Isl	4.10	0.44	9.37			
Western gull	North	Chlordanes	NAS North Isl	1.94	0.44	4.43			
Western gull	North	Chlordanes	NAS North Isl	0.14	0.44	0.32			
California least tern	North	DDTs	Lindbergh Field	193.47	0.16	1241.49	757.57	730.59	5
California least tern	North	DDTs	Lindbergh Field	113.85	0.16	730.59			
California least tern	North	DDTs	Lindbergh Field	92.34	0.16	592.59			
California least tern	North	DDTs	Lindbergh Field	70.95	0.16	455.33			
California least tern	North	DDTs	Lindbergh Field	119.65	0.16	767.83			
California least tern	South	DDTs	Chula Vista Nature Reserve	120.32	0.20	614.77	472.02	443.91	13
California least tern	South	DDTs	Chula Vista Nature Reserve	86.88	0.20	443.91			
California least tern	South	DDTs	Chula Vista Nature Reserve	83.62	0.20	427.24			
California least tern	South	DDTs	Chula Vista Nature Reserve	112.47	0.20	574.66			
California least tern	South	DDTs	D-Street fill	61.56	0.20	314.54			
California least tern	South	DDTs	D-Street fill	59.49	0.20	303.94			
California least tern	South	DDTs	D-Street fill	127.09	0.20	649.36			
California least tern	South	DDTs	D-Street fill	43.32	0.20	221.33			
California least tern	South	DDTs	D-Street fill	55.11	0.20	281.60			
California least tern	South	DDTs	D-Street fill	51.51	0.20	263.18			
California least tern	South	DDTs	Salt Works	187.35	0.20	957.27			
California least tern	South	DDTs	Salt Works	124.24	0.20	634.79			
California least tern	South	DDTs	Salt Works	88.02	0.20	449.72			

Table B3. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g fw)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	BSAF (ng/g fw) / (ng/g dw)	Mean	Median	Count
Caspian tern	South	DDTs	Salt Works	511.30	0.20	2612.47	7550.40	7074.76	10
Caspian tern	South	DDTs	Salt Works	582.67	0.20	2977.16			
Caspian tern	South	DDTs	Salt Works	1301.16	0.20	6648.28			
Caspian tern	South	DDTs	Salt Works	1470.93	0.20	7515.69			
Caspian tern	South	DDTs	Salt Works	2729.30	0.20	13945.31			
Caspian tern	South	DDTs	Salt Works	1013.58	0.20	5178.88			
Caspian tern	South	DDTs	Salt Works	1468.10	0.20	7501.24			
Caspian tern	South	DDTs	Salt Works	587.67	0.20	3002.72			
Caspian tern	South	DDTs	Salt Works	2765.57	0.20	14130.63			
Caspian tern	South	DDTs	Salt Works	2346.93	0.20	11991.59			
Double-crested cormorant	South	DDTs	Salt Works	293.54	0.20	1499.84	6522.05	4468.02	8
Double-crested cormorant	South	DDTs	Salt Works	849.90	0.20	4342.53			
Double-crested cormorant	South	DDTs	Salt Works	881.27	0.20	4502.82			
Double-crested cormorant	South	DDTs	Salt Works	3643.55	0.20	18616.68			
Double-crested cormorant	South	DDTs	Salt Works	2148.82	0.20	10979.39			
Double-crested cormorant	South	DDTs	Salt Works	867.64	0.20	4433.22			
Double-crested cormorant	South	DDTs	Salt Works	600.91	0.20	3070.35			
Double-crested cormorant	South	DDTs	Salt Works	926.04	0.20	4731.57			
Western gull	North	DDTs	NAS North Isl	261.42	0.16	1677.55	2731.27	2236.54	8
Western gull	North	DDTs	NAS North Isl	309.06	0.16	1983.24			
Western gull	North	DDTs	NAS North Isl	388.00	0.16	2489.84			
Western gull	North	DDTs	NAS North Isl	281.08	0.16	1803.70			
Western gull	North	DDTs	NAS North Isl	1000.46	0.16	6420.08			
Western gull	North	DDTs	NAS North Isl	582.11	0.16	3735.46			
Western gull	North	DDTs	NAS North Isl	455.13	0.16	2920.59			
Western gull	North	DDTs	NAS North Isl	127.73	0.16	819.67			
California least tern	North	PBDEs	Lindbergh Field	30.09	1.96	15.35	19.80	16.68	5
California least tern	North	PBDEs	Lindbergh Field	30.79	1.96	15.70			
California least tern	North	PBDEs	Lindbergh Field	32.71	1.96	16.68			
California least tern	North	PBDEs	Lindbergh Field	48.41	1.96	24.69			
California least tern	North	PBDEs	Lindbergh Field	52.05	1.96	26.55			

Table B3. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g fw)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	BSAF (ng/g fw) / (ng/g dw)	Mean	Median	Count
California least tern	South	PBDEs	Chula Vista Nature Reserve	76.88	2.19	35.09	23.66	20.66	13
California least tern	South	PBDEs	Chula Vista Nature Reserve	66.48	2.19	30.34			
California least tern	South	PBDEs	Chula Vista Nature Reserve	38.20	2.19	17.44			
California least tern	South	PBDEs	Chula Vista Nature Reserve	45.27	2.19	20.66			
California least tern	South	PBDEs	D-Street fill	35.52	2.19	16.21			
California least tern	South	PBDEs	D-Street fill	67.05	2.19	30.60			
California least tern	South	PBDEs	D-Street fill	29.76	2.19	13.58			
California least tern	South	PBDEs	D-Street fill	37.10	2.19	16.93			
California least tern	South	PBDEs	D-Street fill	28.01	2.19	12.78			
California least tern	South	PBDEs	D-Street fill	21.28	2.19	9.71			
California least tern	South	PBDEs	Salt Works	60.85	2.19	27.77			
California least tern	South	PBDEs	Salt Works	101.85	2.19	46.49			
California least tern	South	PBDEs	Salt Works	65.61	2.19	29.94			
Caspian tern	South	PBDEs	Salt Works	247.60	2.19	113.01	111.29	114.05	10
Caspian tern	South	PBDEs	Salt Works	82.93	2.19	37.85			
Caspian tern	South	PBDEs	Salt Works	369.28	2.19	168.55			
Caspian tern	South	PBDEs	Salt Works	252.14	2.19	115.08			
Caspian tern	South	PBDEs	Salt Works	261.74	2.19	119.47			
Caspian tern	South	PBDEs	Salt Works	185.22	2.19	84.54			
Caspian tern	South	PBDEs	Salt Works	413.87	2.19	188.90			
Caspian tern	South	PBDEs	Salt Works	163.13	2.19	74.46			
Caspian tern	South	PBDEs	Salt Works	111.51	2.19	50.89			
Caspian tern	South	PBDEs	Salt Works	350.81	2.19	160.12			
Double-crested cormorant	South	PBDEs	Salt Works	28.17	2.19	12.86	40.56	13.52	8
Double-crested cormorant	South	PBDEs	Salt Works	26.68	2.19	12.18			
Double-crested cormorant	South	PBDEs	Salt Works	31.07	2.19	14.18			
Double-crested cormorant	South	PBDEs	Salt Works	280.29	2.19	127.93			
Double-crested cormorant	South	PBDEs	Salt Works	8.77	2.19	4.00			
Double-crested cormorant	South	PBDEs	Salt Works	167.45	2.19	76.43			
Double-crested cormorant	South	PBDEs	Salt Works	18.58	2.19	8.48			
Double-crested cormorant	South	PBDEs	Salt Works	149.86	2.19	68.40			

Table B3. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g fw)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	BSAF (ng/g fw) / (ng/g dw)	Mean	Median	Count
Western gull	North	PBDEs	NAS North Isl	97.08	1.96	49.52	89.88	89.90	8
Western gull	North	PBDEs	NAS North Isl	227.01	1.96	115.80			
Western gull	North	PBDEs	NAS North Isl	278.11	1.96	141.86			
Western gull	North	PBDEs	NAS North Isl	303.01	1.96	154.56			
Western gull	North	PBDEs	NAS North Isl	238.51	1.96	121.66			
Western gull	North	PBDEs	NAS North Isl	87.26	1.96	44.51			
Western gull	North	PBDEs	NAS North Isl	53.12	1.96	27.09			
Western gull	North	PBDEs	NAS North Isl	125.46	1.96	64.00			
California least tern	North	PCBs	Lindbergh Field	134.08	21.03	6.38	12.56	7.52	5
California least tern	North	PCBs	Lindbergh Field	144.61	21.03	6.88			
California least tern	North	PCBs	Lindbergh Field	199.38	21.03	9.48			
California least tern	North	PCBs	Lindbergh Field	158.10	21.03	7.52			
California least tern	North	PCBs	Lindbergh Field	685.02	21.03	32.57			
California least tern	South	PCBs	Chula Vista Nature Reserve	303.83	4.95	61.36	36.40	34.89	13
California least tern	South	PCBs	Chula Vista Nature Reserve	172.76	4.95	34.89			
California least tern	South	PCBs	Chula Vista Nature Reserve	291.92	4.95	58.96			
California least tern	South	PCBs	Chula Vista Nature Reserve	157.69	4.95	31.85			
California least tern	South	PCBs	D-Street fill	77.06	4.95	15.56			
California least tern	South	PCBs	D-Street fill	150.89	4.95	30.47			
California least tern	South	PCBs	D-Street fill	188.69	4.95	38.11			
California least tern	South	PCBs	D-Street fill	85.33	4.95	17.23			
California least tern	South	PCBs	D-Street fill	64.30	4.95	12.99			
California least tern	South	PCBs	D-Street fill	284.12	4.95	57.38			
California least tern	South	PCBs	Salt Works	243.93	4.95	49.26			
California least tern	South	PCBs	Salt Works	211.06	4.95	42.63			
California least tern	South	PCBs	Salt Works	111.15	4.95	22.45			

Table B3. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g fw)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	BSAF (ng/g fw) / (ng/g dw)	Mean	Median	Count
Caspian tern	South	PCBs	Salt Works	677.78	4.95	136.89	96.72	85.64	10
Caspian tern	South	PCBs	Salt Works	301.37	4.95	60.86			
Caspian tern	South	PCBs	Salt Works	133.57	4.95	26.98			
Caspian tern	South	PCBs	Salt Works	633.10	4.95	127.86			
Caspian tern	South	PCBs	Salt Works	453.13	4.95	91.52			
Caspian tern	South	PCBs	Salt Works	1026.70	4.95	207.35			
Caspian tern	South	PCBs	Salt Works	293.29	4.95	59.23			
Caspian tern	South	PCBs	Salt Works	654.55	4.95	132.19			
Caspian tern	South	PCBs	Salt Works	394.93	4.95	79.76			
Caspian tern	South	PCBs	Salt Works	220.64	4.95	44.56			
Double-crested cormorant	South	PCBs	Salt Works	260.13	4.95	52.54	146.99	54.97	8
Double-crested cormorant	South	PCBs	Salt Works	171.78	4.95	34.69			
Double-crested cormorant	South	PCBs	Salt Works	1463.45	4.95	295.56			
Double-crested cormorant	South	PCBs	Salt Works	197.58	4.95	39.90			
Double-crested cormorant	South	PCBs	Salt Works	1950.77	4.95	393.98			
Double-crested cormorant	South	PCBs	Salt Works	284.22	4.95	57.40			
Double-crested cormorant	South	PCBs	Salt Works	227.70	4.95	45.99			
Double-crested cormorant	South	PCBs	Salt Works	1267.05	4.95	255.90			
Western gull	North	PCBs	NAS North Isl	330.31	21.03	15.71	24.61	22.96	8
Western gull	North	PCBs	NAS North Isl	715.73	21.03	34.03			
Western gull	North	PCBs	NAS North Isl	608.04	21.03	28.91			
Western gull	North	PCBs	NAS North Isl	298.93	21.03	14.21			
Western gull	North	PCBs	NAS North Isl	856.91	21.03	40.74			
Western gull	North	PCBs	NAS North Isl	720.65	21.03	34.27			
Western gull	North	PCBs	NAS North Isl	251.85	21.03	11.97			
Western gull	North	PCBs	NAS North Isl	357.77	21.03	17.01			

APPENDIX C. NORMALIZED BSAF SUMMARY

Table C1. Normalized BSAF summary for invertebrates.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Lipid (% ww)	Lipid normalized tissue (ng ww/ g lipid)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	TOC (% dw)	TOC normalized sediment (ng dw/ g OC)	Normalized BSAF (ng ww/g lipid) / (ng/g OC dw)	Mean	Median	Count
Crustacea	North	Chlordanes	B13-8109	0.34	1.52	22.37	0.05	0.50	10.00	2.24	10.72	0.30	5
Crustacea	North	Chlordanes	B13-8118	2.66	1.14	233.33	0.05	1.09	4.59	50.87			
Crustacea	North	Chlordanes	B13-8122	0.05	1.00	5.00	0.05	0.30	16.67	0.30			
Crustacea	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-26	0.05	2.99	1.67	0.05	0.28	17.86	0.09			
Crustacea	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-30	0.05	2.10	2.38	0.05	0.24	20.83	0.11			
Mollusks	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-26	1.00	6.11	16.41	0.05	0.28	17.86	0.92	0.41	0.27	3
Mollusks	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-27	0.05	6.48	0.77	0.05	0.30	16.67	0.05			
Mollusks	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-30	0.05	0.90	5.56	0.05	0.24	20.83	0.27			
Polychaetes	North	Chlordanes	B13-8109	2.38	1.85	128.65	0.05	0.50	10.00	12.86	5.06	2.29	6
Polychaetes	North	Chlordanes	B13-8118	0.05	1.47	3.40	0.05	1.09	4.59	0.74			
Polychaetes	North	Chlordanes	B13-8122	2.91	1.44	202.08	0.05	0.30	16.67	12.12			
Polychaetes	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-26	4.61	7.27	63.35	0.05	0.28	17.86	3.55			
Polychaetes	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-27	1.58	9.23	17.16	0.05	0.30	16.67	1.03			
Polychaetes	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-30	0.05	6.57	0.76	0.05	0.24	20.83	0.04			
Crustacea	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8060	0.05	0.84	5.95	0.05	1.44	3.47	1.71	1.16	1.12	4
Crustacea	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8078	0.05	1.33	3.76	0.05	0.71	7.04	0.53			
Crustacea	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-01	0.05	3.29	1.52	0.05	0.88	5.68	0.27			
Crustacea	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-40	0.24	1.41	17.06	0.05	0.62	8.06	2.12			
Mollusks	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8052	0.05	0.54	9.26	0.05	0.58	8.62	1.07	7.39	2.34	4
Mollusks	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-01	2.15	1.53	140.38	0.05	0.88	5.68	24.71			
Mollusks	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-06	0.05	2.02	2.48	0.05	0.35	14.29	0.17			
Mollusks	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-40	1.05	3.62	29.11	0.05	0.62	8.06	3.61			
Polychaetes	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8052	0.05	1.87	2.67	0.05	0.58	8.62	0.31	1.22	0.46	5
Polychaetes	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8060	1	2.18		0.05	1.44	3.47				
Polychaetes	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8078	0.05	1.55	3.23	0.05	0.71	7.04	0.46			
Polychaetes	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-01	1.49	9.44	15.82	0.05	0.88	5.68	2.78			
Polychaetes	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-06	2.14	6.14	34.89	0.05	0.35	14.29	2.44			
Polychaetes	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-40	0.05	7.48	0.67	0.05	0.62	8.06	0.08			
Crustacea	South	Chlordanes	B13-8017	0.05	0.63	7.94	0.05	1.51	3.31	2.40	1.17	1.06	4
Crustacea	South	Chlordanes	B13-8020	0.05	0.94	5.32	0.05	1.65	3.03	1.76			
Crustacea	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-15	0.05	1.73	2.89	0.05	0.63	7.94	0.36			
Crustacea	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-21	0.05	1.35	3.70	0.05	0.23	21.74	0.17			

Table C1. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Lipid (% ww)	Lipid normalized tissue (ng ww/ g lipid)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	TOC (% dw)	TOC normalized sediment (ng dw/ g OC)	Normalized BSAF (ng ww/g lipid) / (ng/g OC dw)	Mean	Median	Count
Mollusks	South	Chlordanes	B13-8029	0.05	0.34	14.71	0.05	1.51	3.31	4.44	2.21	1.95	4
Mollusks	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-15	0.05	1.31	3.82	0.05	0.63	7.94	0.48			
Mollusks	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-21	0.33	0.48	68.75	0.05	0.23	21.74	3.16			
Mollusks	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-22	0.05	0.95	5.26	0.05	0.70	7.14	0.74			
Polychaetes	South	Chlordanes	B13-8017	0.05	3.00	1.67	0.05	1.51	3.31	0.50	1.06	0.52	6
Polychaetes	South	Chlordanes	B13-8020	0.05	1.87	2.67	0.05	1.65	3.03	0.88			
Polychaetes	South	Chlordanes	B13-8029	0.05	2.85	1.75	0.05	1.51	3.31	0.53			
Polychaetes	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-15	0.05	2.24	2.23	0.05	0.63	7.94	0.28			
Polychaetes	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-21	0.05	1.13	4.42	0.05	0.23	21.74	0.20			
Polychaetes	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-22	1.90	6.72	28.23	0.05	0.70	7.14	3.95			
Crustacea	North	DDTs	B13-8109	21.48	1.52	1413.16	0.05	0.50	10.00	141.32			
Crustacea	North	DDTs	B13-8118	7.12	1.14	624.56	0.05	1.09	4.59	136.15			
Crustacea	North	DDTs	B13-8122	6.82	1.00	682.00	0.05	0.30	16.67	40.92			
Crustacea	North	DDTs	SWHB-26	4.08	2.99	136.55	0.05	0.28	17.86	7.65			
Crustacea	North	DDTs	SWHB-30	6.43	2.10	306.19	0.05	0.24	20.83	14.70			
Mollusks	North	DDTs	SWHB-26	9.79	6.11	160.18	0.05	0.28	17.86	8.97	61.80	8.97	3
Mollusks	North	DDTs	SWHB-27	0.05	6.48	0.77	0.26	0.30	86.67	0.01			
Mollusks	North	DDTs	SWHB-30	33.08	0.90	3675.56	0.05	0.24	20.83	176.43			
Polychaetes	North	DDTs	B13-8109	8.17	1.85	441.62	0.05	0.50	10.00	44.16	37.34	21.74	6
Polychaetes	North	DDTs	B13-8118	8.74	1.47	594.56	0.05	1.09	4.59	129.61			
Polychaetes	North	DDTs	B13-8122	8.36	1.44	580.56	0.05	0.30	16.67	34.83			
Polychaetes	North	DDTs	SWHB-26	11.22	7.27	154.32	0.05	0.28	17.86	8.64			
Polychaetes	North	DDTs	SWHB-27	10.72	9.23	116.13	0.26	0.30	86.67	1.34			
Polychaetes	North	DDTs	SWHB-30	7.44	6.57	113.32	0.05	0.24	20.83	5.44			
Crustacea	Central	DDTs	B13-8060	6.52	0.84	776.19	0.05	1.44	3.47	223.54			
Crustacea	Central	DDTs	B13-8078	3.34	1.33	251.13	0.05	0.71	7.04	35.66			
Crustacea	Central	DDTs	SWHB-01	3.58	3.29	108.93	0.05	0.88	5.68	19.17			
Crustacea	Central	DDTs	SWHB-40	1.06	1.41	74.91	0.05	0.62	8.06	9.29			
Mollusks	Central	DDTs	B13-8052	0.05	0.54	9.26	0.05	0.58	8.62	1.07	26.91	10.95	4
Mollusks	Central	DDTs	SWHB-01	7.36	1.53	481.12	0.05	0.88	5.68	84.68			
Mollusks	Central	DDTs	SWHB-06	2.05	2.02	101.53	0.05	0.35	14.29	7.11			
Mollusks	Central	DDTs	SWHB-40	4.32	3.62	119.29	0.05	0.62	8.06	14.79			

Table C1. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Lipid (% ww)	Lipid normalized tissue (ng ww/ g lipid)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	TOC (% dw)	TOC normalized sediment (ng dw/ g OC)	Normalized BSAF (ng ww/g lipid) / (ng/g OC dw)	Mean	Median	Count
Polychaetes	Central	DDTs	B13-8052	5.79	1.87	309.63	0.05	0.58	8.62	35.92	27.63	28.69	6
Polychaetes	Central	DDTs	B13-8060	4.65	2.18	213.30	0.05	1.44	3.47	61.43			
Polychaetes	Central	DDTs	B13-8078	4.14	1.55	267.10	0.05	0.71	7.04	37.93			
Polychaetes	Central	DDTs	SWHB-01	11.52	9.44	121.99	0.05	0.88	5.68	21.47			
Polychaetes	Central	DDTs	SWHB-06	1.81	6.14	29.41	0.05	0.35	14.29	2.06			
Polychaetes	Central	DDTs	SWHB-40	4.21	7.48	56.25	0.05	0.62	8.06	6.97			
Crustacea	South	DDTs	B13-8017	1.68	0.63	266.67	0.05	1.51	3.31	80.53	115.70	41.44	4
Crustacea	South	DDTs	B13-8020	10.82	0.94	1151.06	0.05	1.65	3.03	379.85			
Crustacea	South	DDTs	SWHB-15	5.97	1.73	345.09	0.93	0.63	147.62	2.34			
Crustacea	South	DDTs	SWHB-21	0.05	1.35	3.70	0.11	0.23	47.83	0.08			
Mollusks	South	DDTs	B13-8029	1.42	0.34	417.65	0.05	1.51	3.31	126.13	40.09	16.26	4
Mollusks	South	DDTs	SWHB-15	3.29	1.31	251.05	0.93	0.63	147.62	1.70			
Mollusks	South	DDTs	SWHB-21	4.42	0.48	920.83	0.11	0.23	47.83	19.25			
Mollusks	South	DDTs	SWHB-22	0.90	0.95	94.75	0.05	0.70	7.14	13.27			
Polychaetes	South	DDTs	B13-8017	4.26	3.00	142.00	0.05	1.51	3.31	42.88	56.15	25.38	6
Polychaetes	South	DDTs	B13-8020	2.79	1.87	149.20	0.05	1.65	3.03	49.24			
Polychaetes	South	DDTs	B13-8029	21.53	2.85	755.44	0.05	1.51	3.31	228.14			
Polychaetes	South	DDTs	SWHB-15	5.55	2.24	247.77	0.93	0.63	147.62	1.68			
Polychaetes	South	DDTs	SWHB-21	4.26	1.13	376.99	0.11	0.23	47.83	7.88			
Polychaetes	South	DDTs	SWHB-22	3.39	6.72	50.45	0.05	0.70	7.14	7.06			
Crustacea	North	PBDEs	B13-8109	2.09	1.52	137.50	0.05	0.50	10.00	13.75	14.10	13.50	5
Crustacea	North	PBDEs	B13-8118	2.96	1.14	259.65	0.07	1.09	6.42	40.43			
Crustacea	North	PBDEs	B13-8122	2.25	1.00	225.00	0.05	0.30	16.67	13.50			
Crustacea	North	PBDEs	SWHB-26	0.70	2.99	23.44	0.05	0.28	17.86	1.31			
Crustacea	North	PBDEs	SWHB-30	2.40	2.10	114.29	0.18	0.24	75.00	1.52			
Mollusks	North	PBDEs	SWHB-26	0.86	6.11	14.06	0.05	0.28	17.86	0.79	2.34	0.79	3
Mollusks	North	PBDEs	SWHB-27	0.59	6.48	9.14	0.09	0.30	30.00	0.30			
Mollusks	North	PBDEs	SWHB-30	4.00	0.90	444.44	0.18	0.24	75.00	5.93			
Polychaetes	North	PBDEs	B13-8109	3.55	1.85	191.89	0.05	0.50	10.00	19.19	16.64	6.87	6
Polychaetes	North	PBDEs	B13-8118	6.17	1.47	419.73	0.07	1.09	6.42	65.36			
Polychaetes	North	PBDEs	B13-8122	3.05	1.44	211.81	0.05	0.30	16.67	12.71			
Polychaetes	North	PBDEs	SWHB-26	1.23	7.27	16.95	0.05	0.28	17.86	0.95			
Polychaetes	North	PBDEs	SWHB-27	1.61	9.23	17.50	0.09	0.30	30.00	0.58			
Polychaetes	North	PBDEs	SWHB-30	5.06	6.57	77.00	0.18	0.24	75.00	1.03			

Table C1. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Lipid (% ww)	Lipid normalized tissue (ng ww/ g lipid)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	TOC (% dw)	TOC normalized sediment (ng dw/ g OC)	Normalized BSAF (ng ww/g lipid) / (ng/g OC dw)	Mean	Median	Count
Crustacea	Central	PBDEs	B13-8060	3.30	0.84	392.86	0.05	1.44	3.47	113.14	39.95	22.76	4
Crustacea	Central	PBDEs	B13-8078	4.97	1.33	373.68	0.06	0.71	8.45	44.22			
Crustacea	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-01	6.36	3.29	193.19	1.31	0.88	148.86	1.30			
Crustacea	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-40	2.16	1.41	153.05	0.82	0.62	132.26	1.16			
Mollusks	Central	PBDEs	B13-8052	1.93	0.54	357.41	0.05	0.58	8.62	41.46	10.62	0.39	4
Mollusks	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-01	0.67	1.53	43.53	1.31	0.88	148.86	0.29			
Mollusks	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-06	0.39	2.02	19.28	0.14	0.35	40.00	0.48			
Mollusks	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-40	1.26	3.62	34.74	0.82	0.62	132.26	0.26			
Polychaetes	Central	PBDEs	B13-8052	8.16	1.87	436.36	0.05	0.58	8.62	50.62	42.05	25.69	6
Polychaetes	Central	PBDEs	B13-8060	10.51	2.18	482.11	0.05	1.44	3.47	138.85			
Polychaetes	Central	PBDEs	B13-8078	8.08	1.55	521.29	0.06	0.71	8.45	61.69			
Polychaetes	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-01	2.14	9.44	22.68	1.31	0.88	148.86	0.15			
Polychaetes	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-06	1.89	6.14	30.83	0.14	0.35	40.00	0.77			
Polychaetes	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-40	1.99	7.48	26.64	0.82	0.62	132.26	0.20			
Crustacea	South	PBDEs	B13-8017	9.19	0.63	1458.73	2.44	1.51	161.59	9.03			
Crustacea	South	PBDEs	B13-8020	8.85	0.94	941.49	27.02	1.65	1637.58	0.57			
Crustacea	South	PBDEs	SWHB-15	0.05	1.73	2.89	0.84	0.63	133.33	0.02			
Crustacea	South	PBDEs	SWHB-21	99.45	1.35	7366.67	0.17	0.23	73.91	99.67			
Mollusks	South	PBDEs	B13-8029	3.26	0.34	958.82	7.42	1.51	491.39	1.95	2.36	1.05	4
Mollusks	South	PBDEs	SWHB-15	0.16	1.31	12.57	0.84	0.63	133.33	0.09			
Mollusks	South	PBDEs	SWHB-21	0.05	0.48	10.42	0.17	0.23	73.91	0.14			
Mollusks	South	PBDEs	SWHB-22	2.17	0.95	228.08	0.22	0.70	31.43	7.26			
Polychaetes	South	PBDEs	B13-8017	21.68	3.00	722.67	2.44	1.51	161.59	4.47	2.18	1.20	6
Polychaetes	South	PBDEs	B13-8020	11.46	1.87	612.83	27.02	1.65	1637.58	0.37			
Polychaetes	South	PBDEs	B13-8029	11.83	2.85	415.09	7.42	1.51	491.39	0.84			
Polychaetes	South	PBDEs	SWHB-15	2.96	2.24	132.14	0.84	0.63	133.33	0.99			
Polychaetes	South	PBDEs	SWHB-21	4.17	1.13	369.03	0.17	0.23	73.91	4.99			
Polychaetes	South	PBDEs	SWHB-22	2.99	6.72	44.47	0.22	0.70	31.43	1.41			
Crustacea	North	PCBs	B13-8109	151.47	1.52	9965.13	3.66	0.50	732.00	13.61	8.13	6.12	5
Crustacea	North	PCBs	B13-8118	161.57	1.14	14172.81	9.34	1.09	856.88	16.54			
Crustacea	North	PCBs	B13-8122	168.59	1.00	16859.00	8.26	0.30	2753.33	6.12			
Crustacea	North	PCBs	SWHB-26	79.30	2.99	2652.25	7.11	0.28	2539.29	1.04			
Crustacea	North	PCBs	SWHB-30	16.84	2.10	801.90	0.58	0.24	241.67	3.32			

Table C1. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Lipid (% ww)	Lipid normalized tissue (ng ww/ g lipid)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	TOC (% dw)	TOC normalized sediment (ng dw/ g OC)	Normalized BSAF (ng ww/g lipid) / (ng/g OC dw)	Mean	Median	Count
Mollusks	North	PCBs	SWHB-26	64.19	6.11	1050.53	7.11	0.28	2539.29	0.41	3.06	0.41	3
Mollusks	North	PCBs	SWHB-27	42.47	6.48	655.41	36.48	0.30	12160.00	0.05			
Mollusks	North	PCBs	SWHB-30	18.94	0.90	2104.44	0.58	0.24	241.67	8.71			
Polychaetes	North	PCBs	B13-8109	132.48	1.85	7161.08	3.66	0.50	732.00	9.78	4.90	2.84	6
Polychaetes	North	PCBs	B13-8118	166.71	1.47	11340.82	9.34	1.09	856.88	13.23			
Polychaetes	North	PCBs	B13-8122	153.95	1.44	10690.97	8.26	0.30	2753.33	3.88			
Polychaetes	North	PCBs	SWHB-26	110.36	7.27	1518.01	7.11	0.28	2539.29	0.60			
Polychaetes	North	PCBs	SWHB-27	138.02	9.23	1495.38	36.48	0.30	12160.00	0.12			
Polychaetes	North	PCBs	SWHB-30	28.52	6.57	434.07	0.58	0.24	241.67	1.80			
Crustacea	Central	PCBs	B13-8060	69.21	0.84	8239.29	5.84	1.44	405.56	20.32	10.15	8.38	4
Crustacea	Central	PCBs	B13-8078	57.33	1.33	4310.53	8.71	0.71	1226.76	3.51			
Crustacea	Central	PCBs	SWHB-01	150.87	3.29	4585.70	5.67	0.88	644.32	7.12			
Crustacea	Central	PCBs	SWHB-40	92.75	1.41	6578.37	4.23	0.62	682.26	9.64			
Mollusks	Central	PCBs	B13-8052	10.18	0.54	1885.19	3.07	0.58	529.31	3.56	6.57	3.84	4
Mollusks	Central	PCBs	SWHB-01	169.42	1.53	11072.92	5.67	0.88	644.32	17.19			
Mollusks	Central	PCBs	SWHB-06	21.14	2.02	1046.58	2.62	0.35	748.57	1.40			
Mollusks	Central	PCBs	SWHB-40	101.63	3.62	2807.40	4.23	0.62	682.26	4.11			
Polychaetes	Central	PCBs	B13-8052	113.90	1.87	6090.91	3.07	0.58	529.31	11.51	7.81	5.27	6
Polychaetes	Central	PCBs	B13-8060	157.48	2.18	7223.85	5.84	1.44	405.56	17.81			
Polychaetes	Central	PCBs	B13-8078	111.85	1.55	7216.13	8.71	0.71	1226.76	5.88			
Polychaetes	Central	PCBs	SWHB-01	283.07	9.44	2998.60	5.67	0.88	644.32	4.65			
Polychaetes	Central	PCBs	SWHB-06	147.57	6.14	2403.49	2.62	0.35	748.57	3.21			
Polychaetes	Central	PCBs	SWHB-40	192.39	7.48	2572.11	4.23	0.62	682.26	3.77			
Crustacea	South	PCBs	B13-8017	28.80	0.63	4571.43	4.96	1.51	328.48	13.92	9.72	9.37	4
Crustacea	South	PCBs	B13-8020	57.94	0.94	6163.83	11.78	1.65	713.94	8.63			
Crustacea	South	PCBs	SWHB-15	31.03	1.73	1793.64	1.81	0.63	287.30	6.24			
Crustacea	South	PCBs	SWHB-21	123.31	1.35	9134.07	2.08	0.23	904.35	10.10			
Mollusks	South	PCBs	B13-8029	9.71	0.34	2855.88	6.57	1.51	435.10	6.56	3.44	3.23	4
Mollusks	South	PCBs	SWHB-15	2.70	1.31	206.18	1.81	0.63	287.30	0.72			
Mollusks	South	PCBs	SWHB-21	23.35	0.48	4864.58	2.08	0.23	904.35	5.38			
Mollusks	South	PCBs	SWHB-22	15.29	0.95	1609.06	10.36	0.70	1480.00	1.09			

Table C1. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Lipid (% ww)	Lipid normalized tissue (ng ww/ g lipid)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	TOC (% dw)	TOC normalized sediment (ng dw/ g OC)	Normalized BSAF (ng ww/g lipid) / (ng/g OC dw)	Mean	Median	Count
Polychaetes	South	PCBs	B13-8017	80.70	3.00	2690.00	4.96	1.51	328.48	8.19	6.94	7.84	6
Polychaetes	South	PCBs	B13-8020	28.43	1.87	1520.32	11.78	1.65	713.94	2.13			
Polychaetes	South	PCBs	B13-8029	112.39	2.85	3943.51	6.57	1.51	435.10	9.06			
Polychaetes	South	PCBs	SWHB-15	48.26	2.24	2154.46	1.81	0.63	287.30	7.50			
Polychaetes	South	PCBs	SWHB-21	146.21	1.13	12938.94	2.08	0.23	904.35	14.31			
Polychaetes	South	PCBs	SWHB-22	47.44	6.72	706.03	10.36	0.70	1480.00	0.48			

¹ Tissue result removed due to apparent outlier

Table C2. Normalized BSAF summary for fish.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Lipid (% ww)	Lipid normalized tissue (ng ww/g lipid)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	TOC (% dw)	TOC normalized sediment (ng/g OC dw)	Normalized BSAF (ng ww/g lipid) / (ng/g OC dw)	Mean	Median	Count
Barred sand bass	North	Chlordanes	B13-8109	3.02	1.54	196.10	0.05	0.50	10.00	19.61	21.54	21.96	4
Barred sand bass	North	Chlordanes	B13-8118	2.03	1.82	111.54	0.05	1.09	4.59	24.32			
Barred sand bass	North	Chlordanes	B13-8118	2.77	1.83	151.37	0.05	1.09	4.59	33.00			
Barred sand bass	North	Chlordanes	B13-8122	2.75	1.79	153.63	0.05	0.30	16.67	9.22			
Black perch	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-26	5.83	11.63	50.11	0.05	0.28	17.86	2.81	1.64	1.64	2
Black perch	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-30	0.58	5.87	9.84	0.05	0.24	20.83	0.47			
California halibut	North	Chlordanes	B13-8109	0.69	0.57	121.05	0.05	0.50	10.00	12.11	11.85	8.38	7
California halibut	North	Chlordanes	B13-8118	0.74	0.72	102.78	0.05	1.09	4.59	22.41			
California halibut	North	Chlordanes	B13-8118	0.89	0.60	148.33	0.05	1.09	4.59	32.34			
California halibut	North	Chlordanes	B13-8122	0.88	0.63	139.68	0.05	0.30	16.67	8.38			
California halibut	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-26	1.72	3.97	43.32	0.05	0.28	17.86	2.43			
California halibut	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-27	2.65	3.13	84.77	0.05	0.30	16.67	5.09			
California halibut	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-30	0.05	1.15	4.35	0.05	0.24	20.83	0.21			
Shiner perch	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-26	0.03	4.39	0.63	0.05	0.28	17.86	0.04	3.02	1.94	3
Shiner perch	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-26	2.88	8.31	34.64	0.05	0.28	17.86	1.94			
Shiner perch	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-27	7.76	6.56	118.25	0.05	0.30	16.67	7.10			
Spotted sand bass	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-26	4.85	9.26	52.39	0.05	0.28	17.86	2.93	2.24	2.18	3
Spotted sand bass	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-27	3.11	8.56	36.38	0.05	0.30	16.67	2.18			
Spotted sand bass	North	Chlordanes	SWHB-30	1.73	5.22	33.18	0.05	0.24	20.83	1.59			
Topsmelt	North	Chlordanes	SDN1	3.43	1.41	243.26	0.44	0.79	55.29	4.40	2.47	1.58	3
Topsmelt	North	Chlordanes	SDN2	1.24	1.42	87.32	0.44	0.79	55.29	1.58			
Topsmelt	North	Chlordanes	SDN3	1.85	2.34	79.06	0.44	0.79	55.29	1.43			
Barred sand bass	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8052	0.63	0.99	63.64	0.05	0.58	8.62	7.38	19.91	19.91	2
Barred sand bass	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8060	2.77	2.46	112.60	0.05	1.44	3.47	32.43			
California halibut	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8052	1.59	0.69	230.43	0.05	0.58	8.62	26.73	20.16	8.78	7
California halibut	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8060	1.34	0.58	231.03	0.05	1.44	3.47	66.54			
California halibut	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8078	0.71	0.37	191.89	0.05	0.71	7.04	27.25			
California halibut	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-01	1.16	2.32	49.90	0.05	0.88	5.68	8.78			
California halibut	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-06	0.51	2.46	20.66	0.05	0.35	14.29	1.45			
California halibut	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-06	0.51	2.18	23.60	0.05	0.35	14.29	1.65			
California halibut	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-40	3.08	4.38	70.28	0.05	0.62	8.06	8.71			

Table C2. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Lipid (% ww)	Lipid normalized tissue (ng ww/g lipid)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	TOC (% dw)	TOC normalized sediment (ng/g OC dw)	Normalized BSAF (ng ww/g lipid) / (ng/g OC dw)	Mean	Median	Count
Deepbody anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8052	6.29	3.21	195.95	0.05	0.58	8.62	22.73	39.07	38.00	6
Deepbody anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8052	6.65	3.20	207.81	0.05	0.58	8.62	24.11			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8052	6.47	3.25	199.08	0.05	0.58	8.62	23.09			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8060	2.72	1.36	200.00	0.05	1.44	3.47	57.60			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8060	2.27	1.26	180.16	0.05	1.44	3.47	51.89			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8060	2.54	1.33	190.98	0.05	1.44	3.47	55.00			
Shiner perch	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-01	1.27	10.26	12.33	0.05	0.88	5.68	2.17			
Shiner perch	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-40	3.83	6.22	61.64	0.05	0.62	8.06	7.64			
Slough anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8052	1.00	0.93	107.53	0.05	0.58	8.62	12.47	20.21	12.52	8
Slough anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8052	1.16	1.07	108.41	0.05	0.58	8.62	12.58			
Slough anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8052	0.85	0.94	90.43	0.05	0.58	8.62	10.49			
Slough anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8060	2.52	1.22	206.56	0.05	1.44	3.47	59.49			
Slough anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8060	1.00	1.07	93.46	0.05	1.44	3.47	26.92			
Slough anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8060	1.09	1.13	96.46	0.05	1.44	3.47	27.78			
Slough anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	SDC1	1.24	1.42	87.32	0.07	0.90	7.57	11.54			
Slough anchovy	Central	Chlordanes	SDC3	0.05	1.72	2.91	0.07	0.90	7.57	0.38			
Spotted sand bass	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8060	3.36	1.66	202.41	0.05	1.44	3.47	58.29	19.22	6.45	5
Spotted sand bass	Central	Chlordanes	B13-8078	1.28	0.76	168.42	0.05	0.71	7.04	23.92			
Spotted sand bass	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-01	2.91	7.93	36.67	0.05	0.88	5.68	6.45			
Spotted sand bass	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-06	3.95	6.86	57.58	0.05	0.35	14.29	4.03			
Spotted sand bass	Central	Chlordanes	SWHB-40	1.35	4.89	27.53	0.05	0.62	8.06	3.41			
Topsmelt	Central	Chlordanes	SDC1	0.54	1.20	45.00	0.07	0.90	7.57	5.95	10.34	11.36	3
Topsmelt	Central	Chlordanes	SDC2	0.98	1.14	85.96	0.07	0.90	7.57	11.36			
Topsmelt	Central	Chlordanes	SDC3	1.11	1.07	103.74	0.07	0.90	7.57	13.71			
Arrow goby	South	Chlordanes	SDS2/3	0.05	4.15	1.20	0.05	0.95	5.26	0.23	0.23	0.23	1
Barred sand bass	South	Chlordanes	B13-8017	0.24	1.44	16.67	0.05	1.51	3.31	5.03	16.67	5.03	3
Barred sand bass	South	Chlordanes	B13-8020	0.05	0.91	5.49	0.05	1.65	3.03	1.81			
Barred sand bass	South	Chlordanes	B13-8029	1.93	1.35	142.96	0.05	1.51	3.31	43.17			
California halibut	South	Chlordanes	B13-8020	0.90	0.77	116.88	0.05	1.65	3.03	38.57	16.99	3.25	6
California halibut	South	Chlordanes	B13-8029	1.99	1.10	180.91	0.05	1.51	3.31	54.63			
California halibut	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-15	0.29	2.79	10.55	0.05	0.63	7.94	1.33			
California halibut	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-21	1.15	2.54	45.21	0.05	0.23	21.74	2.08			
California halibut	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-21	0.65	3.29	19.85	0.05	0.23	21.74	0.91			
California halibut	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-22	0.78	2.46	31.62	0.05	0.70	7.14	4.43			

Table C2. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Lipid (% ww)	Lipid normalized tissue (ng ww/g lipid)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	TOC (% dw)	TOC normalized sediment (ng/g OC dw)	Normalized BSAF (ng ww/g lipid) / (ng/g OC dw)	Mean	Median	Count
California killifish	South	Chlordanes	SDS2	0.05	1.77	2.82	0.05	0.95	5.26	0.54	0.50	0.50	2
California killifish	South	Chlordanes	SDS3	0.05	2.07	2.42	0.05	0.95	5.26	0.46			
Deepbody anchovy	South	Chlordanes	B13-8017	0.76	0.86	88.37	0.05	1.51	3.31	26.69	28.84	26.69	5
Deepbody anchovy	South	Chlordanes	B13-8020	0.26	1.00	26.00	0.05	1.65	3.03	8.58			
Deepbody anchovy	South	Chlordanes	B13-8020	1.02	1.18	86.44	0.05	1.65	3.03	28.53			
Deepbody anchovy	South	Chlordanes	B13-8020	0.05	0.72	6.94	0.05	1.65	3.03	2.29			
Deepbody anchovy	South	Chlordanes	B13-8029	2.25	0.87	258.62	0.05	1.51	3.31	78.10			
Northern anchovy	South	Chlordanes	SDS2	0.05	1.67	2.99	0.05	0.95	5.26	0.57	0.59	0.59	2
Northern anchovy	South	Chlordanes	SDS3	0.05	1.57	3.18	0.05	0.95	5.26	0.61			
Round stingray	South	Chlordanes	B13-8017	10.21	5.00	204.20	0.05	1.51	3.31	61.67	61.67	61.67	1
Shiner perch	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-22	0.14	7.09	1.98	0.05	0.70	7.14	0.28	0.28	0.28	1
Slough anchovy	South	Chlordanes	B13-8020	0.05	1.14	4.39	0.05	1.65	3.03	1.45	3.58	3.58	2
Slough anchovy	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-15	3.58	7.90	45.34	0.05	0.63	7.94	5.71			
Spotted sand bass	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-15	1.85	5.84	31.72	0.05	0.63	7.94	4.00	3.23	3.53	3
Spotted sand bass	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-21	3.38	7.23	46.70	0.05	0.23	21.74	2.15			
Spotted sand bass	South	Chlordanes	SWHB-22	2.63	10.43	25.24	0.05	0.70	7.14	3.53			
Topsmelt	South	Chlordanes	SDS1	1.50	1.00	150.00	0.05	0.95	5.26	28.54	13.19	9.85	3
Topsmelt	South	Chlordanes	SDS2	0.05	0.81	6.17	0.05	0.95	5.26	1.17			
Topsmelt	South	Chlordanes	SDS3	0.58	1.12	51.79	0.05	0.95	5.26	9.85			
Barred sand bass	North	DDTs	B13-8109	18.71	1.54	1214.94	0.05	0.50	10.00	121.49	200.88	141.34	4
Barred sand bass	North	DDTs	B13-8118	13.53	1.83	739.34	0.05	1.09	4.59	161.18			
Barred sand bass	North	DDTs	B13-8118	40.32	1.82	2215.38	0.05	1.09	4.59	482.95			
Barred sand bass	North	DDTs	B13-8122	11.31	1.79	631.84	0.05	0.30	16.67	37.91			
Black perch	North	DDTs	SWHB-26	20.11	11.63	172.92	0.05	0.28	17.86	9.68	7.46	7.46	2
Black perch	North	DDTs	SWHB-30	6.39	5.87	108.89	0.05	0.24	20.83	5.23			
California halibut	North	DDTs	B13-8109	8.16	0.57	1431.58	0.05	0.50	10.00	143.16	190.65	143.16	7
California halibut	North	DDTs	B13-8118	10.51	0.72	1459.72	0.05	1.09	4.59	318.22			
California halibut	North	DDTs	B13-8118	13.25	0.60	2208.33	0.05	1.09	4.59	481.42			
California halibut	North	DDTs	B13-8122	37.71	0.63	5985.71	0.05	0.30	16.67	359.14			
California halibut	North	DDTs	SWHB-26	12.25	3.97	308.64	0.05	0.28	17.86	17.28			
California halibut	North	DDTs	SWHB-27	12.98	3.13	414.60	0.26	0.30	86.67	4.78			
California halibut	North	DDTs	SWHB-30	2.52	1.15	219.01	0.05	0.24	20.83	10.51			

Table C2. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Lipid (% ww)	Lipid normalized tissue (ng ww/g lipid)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	TOC (% dw)	TOC normalized sediment (ng/g OC dw)	Normalized BSAF (ng ww/g lipid) / (ng/g OC dw)	Mean	Median	Count
Shiner perch	North	DDTs	SWHB-26	4.08	4.39	92.91	0.05	0.28	17.86	5.20	7.71	5.20	3
Shiner perch	North	DDTs	SWHB-26	20.87	8.31	251.09	0.05	0.28	17.86	14.06			
Shiner perch	North	DDTs	SWHB-27	22.05	6.56	336.19	0.26	0.30	86.67	3.88			
Spotted sand bass	North	DDTs	SWHB-26	12.72	9.26	137.38	0.05	0.28	17.86	7.69	7.93	7.69	3
Spotted sand bass	North	DDTs	SWHB-27	10.20	8.56	119.21	0.26	0.30	86.67	1.38			
Spotted sand bass	North	DDTs	SWHB-30	16.01	5.22	306.77	0.05	0.24	20.83	14.72			
Topsmelt	North	DDTs	SDN1	6.45	1.41	457.45	0.16	0.79	19.67	23.25	26.42	25.39	3
Topsmelt	North	DDTs	SDN2	8.55	1.42	602.11	0.16	0.79	19.67	30.60			
Topsmelt	North	DDTs	SDN3	11.69	2.34	499.57	0.16	0.79	19.67	25.39			
Barred sand bass	Central	DDTs	B13-8052	4.82	0.99	486.87	0.05	0.58	8.62	56.48	151.52	151.52	2
Barred sand bass	Central	DDTs	B13-8060	21.06	2.46	856.10	0.05	1.44	3.47	246.56			
California halibut	Central	DDTs	B13-8052	12.69	0.69	1839.13	0.05	0.58	8.62	213.34	174.66	63.65	7
California halibut	Central	DDTs	B13-8060	10.42	0.58	1796.55	0.05	1.44	3.47	517.41			
California halibut	Central	DDTs	B13-8078	9.31	0.37	2516.22	0.05	0.71	7.04	357.30			
California halibut	Central	DDTs	SWHB-01	8.39	2.32	361.67	0.05	0.88	5.68	63.65			
California halibut	Central	DDTs	SWHB-06	6.08	2.46	246.96	0.05	0.35	14.29	17.29			
California halibut	Central	DDTs	SWHB-06	4.82	2.18	221.27	0.05	0.35	14.29	15.49			
California halibut	Central	DDTs	SWHB-40	13.48	4.38	307.75	0.05	0.62	8.06	38.16			
California halibut	Central	DDTs	SWHB-40	13.48	4.38	307.75	0.05	0.62	8.06	38.16			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	DDTs	B13-8052	38.72	3.25	1191.38	0.05	0.58	8.62	138.20	268.68	260.91	6
Deepbody anchovy	Central	DDTs	B13-8052	46.36	3.21	1444.24	0.05	0.58	8.62	167.53			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	DDTs	B13-8052	42.95	3.20	1342.19	0.05	0.58	8.62	155.69			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	DDTs	B13-8060	17.04	1.26	1352.38	0.05	1.44	3.47	389.49			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	DDTs	B13-8060	16.73	1.36	1230.15	0.05	1.44	3.47	354.28			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	DDTs	B13-8060	18.79	1.33	1412.78	0.05	1.44	3.47	406.88			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	DDTs	B13-8060	18.79	1.33	1412.78	0.05	1.44	3.47	406.88			
Shiner perch	Central	DDTs	SWHB-01	12.48	10.26	121.68	0.05	0.88	5.68	21.41	26.92	26.92	2
Shiner perch	Central	DDTs	SWHB-40	16.27	6.22	261.55	0.05	0.62	8.06	32.43			
Slough anchovy	Central	DDTs	B13-8052	8.67	0.94	922.34	0.05	0.58	8.62	106.99	181.77	112.83	8
Slough anchovy	Central	DDTs	B13-8052	8.03	0.93	863.44	0.05	0.58	8.62	100.16			
Slough anchovy	Central	DDTs	B13-8052	8.32	1.07	777.57	0.05	0.58	8.62	90.20			
Slough anchovy	Central	DDTs	B13-8060	14.89	1.13	1317.70	0.05	1.44	3.47	379.50			
Slough anchovy	Central	DDTs	B13-8060	12.33	1.22	1010.66	0.05	1.44	3.47	291.07			
Slough anchovy	Central	DDTs	B13-8060	11.16	1.07	1042.99	0.05	1.44	3.47	300.38			
Slough anchovy	Central	DDTs	SDC1	12.75	1.42	897.89	0.07	0.90	7.57	118.67			
Slough anchovy	Central	DDTs	SDC3	8.74	1.72	508.14	0.07	0.90	7.57	67.16			

Table C2. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Lipid (% ww)	Lipid normalized tissue (ng ww/g lipid)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	TOC (% dw)	TOC normalized sediment (ng/g OC dw)	Normalized BSAF (ng ww/g lipid) / (ng/g OC dw)	Mean	Median	Count
Spotted sand bass	Central	DDTs	B13-8060	10.06	1.66	606.02	0.05	1.44	3.47	174.53	65.26	23.52	5
Spotted sand bass	Central	DDTs	B13-8078	5.62	0.76	739.47	0.05	0.71	7.04	105.01			
Spotted sand bass	Central	DDTs	SWHB-01	10.60	7.93	133.63	0.05	0.88	5.68	23.52			
Spotted sand bass	Central	DDTs	SWHB-06	13.22	6.86	192.76	0.05	0.35	14.29	13.49			
Spotted sand bass	Central	DDTs	SWHB-40	3.85	4.89	78.80	0.05	0.62	8.06	9.77			
Topsmelt	Central	DDTs	SDC1	10.44	1.20	870.00	0.07	0.90	7.57	114.99	75.32	62.50	3
Topsmelt	Central	DDTs	SDC2	4.18	1.14	366.67	0.07	0.90	7.57	48.46			
Topsmelt	Central	DDTs	SDC3	5.06	1.07	472.90	0.07	0.90	7.57	62.50			
Arrow goby	South	DDTs	SDS2/3	0.05	4.15	1.20	0.20	0.95	20.57	0.06	0.06	0.06	1
Barred sand bass	South	DDTs	B13-8017	13.58	1.44	943.06	0.05	1.51	3.31	284.80	290.13	284.80	3
Barred sand bass	South	DDTs	B13-8020	7.45	0.91	818.68	0.05	1.65	3.03	270.16			
Barred sand bass	South	DDTs	B13-8029	14.10	1.35	1044.44	0.05	1.51	3.31	315.42			
California halibut	South	DDTs	B13-8020	11.98	0.77	1555.84	0.05	1.65	3.03	513.43	168.24	29.49	6
California halibut	South	DDTs	B13-8029	15.56	1.10	1414.55	0.05	1.51	3.31	427.19			
California halibut	South	DDTs	SWHB-15	12.22	2.79	437.85	0.93	0.63	147.62	2.97			
California halibut	South	DDTs	SWHB-21	11.88	2.54	467.84	0.11	0.23	47.83	9.78			
California halibut	South	DDTs	SWHB-21	10.78	3.29	327.53	0.11	0.23	47.83	6.85			
California halibut	South	DDTs	SWHB-22	8.64	2.46	351.39	0.05	0.70	7.14	49.19			
California killifish	South	DDTs	SDS2	1.81	1.77	102.26	0.20	0.95	20.57	4.97	15.68	15.68	2
California killifish	South	DDTs	SDS3	11.24	2.07	543.00	0.20	0.95	20.57	26.40			
Deepbody anchovy	South	DDTs	B13-8017	6.41	0.86	745.35	0.05	1.51	3.31	225.10	331.52	300.67	5
Deepbody anchovy	South	DDTs	B13-8020	8.67	1.18	734.75	0.05	1.65	3.03	242.47			
Deepbody anchovy	South	DDTs	B13-8020	10.72	1.00	1072.00	0.05	1.65	3.03	353.76			
Deepbody anchovy	South	DDTs	B13-8020	6.56	0.72	911.11	0.05	1.65	3.03	300.67			
Deepbody anchovy	South	DDTs	B13-8029	15.43	0.87	1773.56	0.05	1.51	3.31	535.62			
Northern anchovy	South	DDTs	SDS2	9.61	1.67	575.45	0.20	0.95	20.57	27.97	26.64	26.64	2
Northern anchovy	South	DDTs	SDS3	8.17	1.57	520.38	0.20	0.95	20.57	25.30			
Round stingray	South	DDTs	B13-8017	0.55	5.00	11.00	0.05	1.51	3.31	3.32	3.32	3.32	1
Shiner perch	South	DDTs	SWHB-22	11.33	7.09	159.86	0.05	0.70	7.14	22.38	22.38	22.38	1
Slough anchovy	South	DDTs	B13-8020	6.19	1.14	542.98	0.05	1.65	3.03	179.18	90.92	90.92	2
Slough anchovy	South	DDTs	SWHB-15	30.88	7.90	390.92	0.93	0.63	147.62	2.65			
Spotted sand bass	South	DDTs	SWHB-15	15.80	5.84	270.60	0.93	0.63	147.62	1.83	6.48	2.87	3
Spotted sand bass	South	DDTs	SWHB-21	9.94	7.23	137.46	0.11	0.23	47.83	2.87			
Spotted sand bass	South	DDTs	SWHB-22	10.98	10.43	105.30	0.05	0.70	7.14	14.74			

Table C2. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Lipid (% ww)	Lipid normalized tissue (ng ww/g lipid)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	TOC (% dw)	TOC normalized sediment (ng/g OC dw)	Normalized BSAF (ng ww/g lipid) / (ng/g OC dw)	Mean	Median	Count
Topsmelt	South	DDTs	SDS1	7.76	1.00	776.00	0.20	0.95	20.57	37.72	25.44	22.15	3
Topsmelt	South	DDTs	SDS2	3.69	0.81	455.56	0.20	0.95	20.57	22.15			
Topsmelt	South	DDTs	SDS3	3.79	1.12	338.39	0.20	0.95	20.57	16.45			
Barred sand bass	North	PBDEs	B13-8109	2.04	1.54	132.47	0.05	0.50	10.00	13.25	23.69	23.49	4
Barred sand bass	North	PBDEs	B13-8118	2.29	1.82	125.82	0.07	1.09	6.42	19.59			
Barred sand bass	North	PBDEs	B13-8118	4.06	1.83	221.86	0.07	1.09	6.42	34.55			
Barred sand bass	North	PBDEs	B13-8122	8.17	1.79	456.42	0.05	0.30	16.67	27.39			
Black perch	North	PBDEs	SWHB-26	7.19	11.63	61.81	0.05	0.28	17.86	3.46	2.06	2.06	2
Black perch	North	PBDEs	SWHB-30	2.86	5.87	48.73	0.18	0.24	75.00	0.65			
California halibut	North	PBDEs	B13-8109	0.99	0.57	173.68	0.05	0.50	10.00	17.37	14.83	17.24	7
California halibut	North	PBDEs	B13-8118	1.31	0.60	218.33	0.07	1.09	6.42	34.00			
California halibut	North	PBDEs	B13-8118	1.37	0.72	190.28	0.07	1.09	6.42	29.63			
California halibut	North	PBDEs	B13-8122	1.81	0.63	287.30	0.05	0.30	16.67	17.24			
California halibut	North	PBDEs	SWHB-26	1.48	3.97	37.39	0.05	0.28	17.86	2.09			
California halibut	North	PBDEs	SWHB-27	2.38	3.13	76.03	0.09	0.30	30.00	2.53			
California halibut	North	PBDEs	SWHB-30	0.81	1.15	70.61	0.18	0.24	75.00	0.94			
Shiner perch	North	PBDEs	SWHB-26	12.51	8.31	150.49	0.05	0.28	17.86	8.43	5.54	4.20	3
Shiner perch	North	PBDEs	SWHB-26	3.29	4.39	74.92	0.05	0.28	17.86	4.20			
Shiner perch	North	PBDEs	SWHB-27	7.84	6.56	119.58	0.09	0.30	30.00	3.99			
Spotted sand bass	North	PBDEs	SWHB-26	1.25	9.26	13.51	0.05	0.28	17.86	0.76	0.68	0.76	3
Spotted sand bass	North	PBDEs	SWHB-27	1.06	8.56	12.44	0.09	0.30	30.00	0.41			
Spotted sand bass	North	PBDEs	SWHB-30	3.41	5.22	65.38	0.18	0.24	75.00	0.87			
Topsmelt	North	PBDEs	SDN1	5.30	1.41	375.89	1.96	0.79	247.50	1.52	1.29	1.32	3
Topsmelt	North	PBDEs	SDN2	3.67	1.42	258.45	1.96	0.79	247.50	1.04			
Topsmelt	North	PBDEs	SDN3	7.63	2.34	326.07	1.96	0.79	247.50	1.32			
Barred sand bass	Central	PBDEs	B13-8052	7.02	0.99	709.09	0.05	0.58	8.62	82.25	58.22	58.22	2
Barred sand bass	Central	PBDEs	B13-8060	2.92	2.46	118.70	0.05	1.44	3.47	34.19			
California halibut	Central	PBDEs	B13-8052	3.84	0.69	556.52	0.05	0.58	8.62	64.56	37.57	0.74	7
California halibut	Central	PBDEs	B13-8060	2.72	0.58	468.97	0.05	1.44	3.47	135.06			
California halibut	Central	PBDEs	B13-8078	1.92	0.37	518.92	0.06	0.71	8.45	61.41			
California halibut	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-01	1.47	2.32	63.24	1.31	0.88	148.86	0.42			
California halibut	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-06	0.46	2.18	21.29	0.14	0.35	40.00	0.53			
California halibut	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-06	0.73	2.46	29.74	0.14	0.35	40.00	0.74			
California halibut	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-40	1.70	4.38	38.82	0.82	0.62	132.26	0.29			

Table C2. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Lipid (% ww)	Lipid normalized tissue (ng ww/g lipid)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	TOC (% dw)	TOC normalized sediment (ng/g OC dw)	Normalized BSAF (ng ww/g lipid) / (ng/g OC dw)	Mean	Median	Count
Deepbody anchovy	Central	PBDEs	B13-8052	0.06	3.20	1.87	0.05	0.58	8.62	0.22	1.21	0.78	6
Deepbody anchovy	Central	PBDEs	B13-8052	0.07	3.25	2.15	0.05	0.58	8.62	0.25			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	PBDEs	B13-8052	0.14	3.21	4.36	0.05	0.58	8.62	0.51			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	PBDEs	B13-8060	0.19	1.33	14.29	0.05	1.44	3.47	4.11			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	PBDEs	B13-8060	0.05	1.26	3.97	0.05	1.44	3.47	1.14			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	PBDEs	B13-8060	0.05	1.36	3.68	0.05	1.44	3.47	1.06			
Shiner perch	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-01	11.77	10.26	114.74	1.31	0.88	148.86	0.77	0.92	0.92	2
Shiner perch	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-40	8.81	6.22	141.62	0.82	0.62	132.26	1.07			
Slough anchovy	Central	PBDEs	B13-8052	0.08	0.94	8.51	0.05	0.58	8.62	0.99	3.43	1.08	8
Slough anchovy	Central	PBDEs	B13-8052	0.05	1.07	4.67	0.05	0.58	8.62	0.54			
Slough anchovy	Central	PBDEs	B13-8052	0.58	0.93	62.37	0.05	0.58	8.62	7.23			
Slough anchovy	Central	PBDEs	B13-8060	0.05	1.22	4.10	0.05	1.44	3.47	1.18			
Slough anchovy	Central	PBDEs	B13-8060	0.23	1.07	21.50	0.05	1.44	3.47	6.19			
Slough anchovy	Central	PBDEs	B13-8060	0.40	1.13	35.40	0.05	1.44	3.47	10.19			
Slough anchovy	Central	PBDEs	SDC1	3.36	1.42	236.62	3.31	0.90	369.33	0.64			
Slough anchovy	Central	PBDEs	SDC3	2.87	1.72	166.86	3.31	0.90	369.33	0.45			
Spotted sand bass	Central	PBDEs	B13-8060	1.79	1.66	107.83	0.05	1.44	3.47	31.06	6.76	0.46	5
Spotted sand bass	Central	PBDEs	B13-8078	0.14	0.76	18.42	0.06	0.71	8.45	2.18			
Spotted sand bass	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-01	0.55	7.93	6.92	1.31	0.88	148.86	0.05			
Spotted sand bass	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-06	1.26	6.86	18.40	0.14	0.35	40.00	0.46			
Spotted sand bass	Central	PBDEs	SWHB-40	0.22	4.89	4.55	0.82	0.62	132.26	0.03			
Topsmelt	Central	PBDEs	SDC1	15.20	1.20	1266.67	3.31	0.90	369.33	3.43	1.45	0.55	3
Topsmelt	Central	PBDEs	SDC2	2.31	1.14	202.63	3.31	0.90	369.33	0.55			
Topsmelt	Central	PBDEs	SDC3	1.49	1.07	139.25	3.31	0.90	369.33	0.38			
Arrow goby	South	PBDEs	SDS2/3	19.53	4.15	470.60	2.19	0.95	230.28	2.04	2.04	2.04	1
Barred sand bass	South	PBDEs	B13-8017	1.51	1.44	104.86	2.44	1.51	161.59	0.65	0.36	0.27	3
Barred sand bass	South	PBDEs	B13-8020	2.41	0.91	264.84	27.02	1.65	1637.58	0.16			
Barred sand bass	South	PBDEs	B13-8029	1.79	1.35	132.59	7.42	1.51	491.39	0.27			

Table C2. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Lipid (% ww)	Lipid normalized tissue (ng ww/g lipid)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	TOC (% dw)	TOC normalized sediment (ng/g OC dw)	Normalized BSAF (ng ww/g lipid) / (ng/g OC dw)	Mean	Median	Count
California halibut	South	PBDEs	B13-8020	4.19	0.77	544.16	27.02	1.65	1637.58	0.33	0.56	0.54	6
California halibut	South	PBDEs	B13-8029	4.08	1.10	370.91	7.42	1.51	491.39	0.75			
California halibut	South	PBDEs	SWHB-15	0.67	2.79	23.90	0.84	0.63	133.33	0.18			
California halibut	South	PBDEs	SWHB-21	1.23	3.29	37.44	0.17	0.23	73.91	0.51			
California halibut	South	PBDEs	SWHB-21	1.90	2.54	74.71	0.17	0.23	73.91	1.01			
California halibut	South	PBDEs	SWHB-22	0.45	2.46	18.13	0.22	0.70	31.43	0.58			
California killifish	South	PBDEs	SDS2	4.36	1.77	246.33	2.19	0.95	230.28	1.07	0.63	0.63	2
California killifish	South	PBDEs	SDS3	0.92	2.07	44.44	2.19	0.95	230.28	0.19			
Deepbody anchovy	South	PBDEs	B13-8017	0.05	0.86	5.81	2.44	1.51	161.59	0.04	0.02	0.01	5
Deepbody anchovy	South	PBDEs	B13-8020	0.16	1.18	13.56	27.02	1.65	1637.58	0.01			
Deepbody anchovy	South	PBDEs	B13-8020	0.28	1.00	28.00	27.02	1.65	1637.58	0.02			
Deepbody anchovy	South	PBDEs	B13-8020	0.05	0.72	6.94	27.02	1.65	1637.58	0.00			
Deepbody anchovy	South	PBDEs	B13-8029	0.05	0.87	5.75	7.42	1.51	491.39	0.01			
Deepbody anchovy	South	PBDEs	B13-8020	0.05	0.86	5.81	2.44	1.51	161.59	0.04			
Northern anchovy	South	PBDEs	SDS2	0.05	1.67	2.99	2.19	0.95	230.28	0.01	2.38	2.38	2
Northern anchovy	South	PBDEs	SDS3	17.16	1.57	1092.99	2.19	0.95	230.28	4.75			
Round stingray	South	PBDEs	B13-8017	10.08	5.00	201.60	2.44	1.51	161.59	1.25	1.25	1.25	1
Shiner perch	South	PBDEs	SWHB-22	1.87	7.09	26.34	0.22	0.70	31.43	0.84	0.84	0.84	1
Slough anchovy	South	PBDEs	B13-8020	0.56	1.14	49.12	27.02	1.65	1637.58	0.03	0.10	0.10	2
Slough anchovy	South	PBDEs	SWHB-15	1.88	7.90	23.83	0.84	0.63	133.33	0.18			
Spotted sand bass	South	PBDEs	SWHB-15	1.72	5.84	29.39	0.84	0.63	133.33	0.22	0.17	0.16	3
Spotted sand bass	South	PBDEs	SWHB-21	0.86	7.23	11.90	0.17	0.23	73.91	0.16			
Spotted sand bass	South	PBDEs	SWHB-22	0.43	10.43	4.12	0.22	0.70	31.43	0.13			
Topsmelt	South	PBDEs	SDS1	10.93	1.00	1093.00	2.19	0.95	230.28	4.75	5.05	4.75	3
Topsmelt	South	PBDEs	SDS2	16.88	0.81	2083.95	2.19	0.95	230.28	9.05			
Topsmelt	South	PBDEs	SDS3	3.53	1.12	315.18	2.19	0.95	230.28	1.37			
Barred sand bass	North	PCBs	B13-8109	246.27	1.54	15991.56	3.66	0.50	732.00	21.85	13.60	13.82	4
Barred sand bass	North	PCBs	B13-8118	208.84	1.82	11474.73	9.34	1.09	856.88	13.39			
Barred sand bass	North	PCBs	B13-8118	223.53	1.83	12214.75	9.34	1.09	856.88	14.25			
Barred sand bass	North	PCBs	B13-8122	242.22	1.79	13531.84	8.26	0.30	2753.33	4.91			
Black perch	North	PCBs	SWHB-26	431.51	11.63	3710.28	7.11	0.28	2539.29	1.46	2.40	2.40	2
Black perch	North	PCBs	SWHB-30	47.23	5.87	804.59	0.58	0.24	241.67	3.33			

Table C2. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Lipid (% ww)	Lipid normalized tissue (ng ww/g lipid)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	TOC (% dw)	TOC normalized sediment (ng/g OC dw)	Normalized BSAF (ng ww/g lipid) / (ng/g OC dw)	Mean	Median	Count
California halibut	North	PCBs	B13-8109	123.94	0.57	21743.86	3.66	0.50	732.00	29.70	16.18	10.77	7
California halibut	North	PCBs	B13-8118	141.22	0.72	19613.89	9.34	1.09	856.88	22.89			
California halibut	North	PCBs	B13-8118	193.10	0.60	32183.33	9.34	1.09	856.88	37.56			
California halibut	North	PCBs	B13-8122	186.84	0.63	29657.14	8.26	0.30	2753.33	10.77			
California halibut	North	PCBs	SWHB-26	259.45	3.97	6535.32	7.11	0.28	2539.29	2.57			
California halibut	North	PCBs	SWHB-27	209.29	3.13	6686.42	36.48	0.30	12160.00	0.55			
California halibut	North	PCBs	SWHB-30	25.69	1.15	2233.74	0.58	0.24	241.67	9.24			
Shiner perch	North	PCBs	SWHB-26	29.95	4.39	682.29	7.11	0.28	2539.29	0.27	0.46	0.49	3
Shiner perch	North	PCBs	SWHB-26	130.05	8.31	1564.99	7.11	0.28	2539.29	0.62			
Shiner perch	North	PCBs	SWHB-27	388.14	6.56	5916.73	36.48	0.30	12160.00	0.49			
Spotted sand bass	North	PCBs	SWHB-26	303.61	9.26	3278.70	7.11	0.28	2539.29	1.29	4.46	1.29	3
Spotted sand bass	North	PCBs	SWHB-27	418.37	8.56	4887.46	36.48	0.30	12160.00	0.40			
Spotted sand bass	North	PCBs	SWHB-30	147.61	5.22	2827.68	0.58	0.24	241.67	11.70			
Topsmelt	North	PCBs	SDN1	209.93	1.41	14888.65	21.03	0.79	2655.18	5.61	3.55	3.44	3
Topsmelt	North	PCBs	SDN2	129.81	1.42	9141.55	21.03	0.79	2655.18	3.44			
Topsmelt	North	PCBs	SDN3	98.53	2.34	4210.68	21.03	0.79	2655.18	1.59			
Barred sand bass	Central	PCBs	B13-8052	117.92	0.99	11911.11	3.07	0.58	529.31	22.50	29.74	29.74	2
Barred sand bass	Central	PCBs	B13-8060	368.87	2.46	14994.72	5.84	1.44	405.56	36.97			
California halibut	Central	PCBs	B13-8052	298.47	0.69	43256.52	3.07	0.58	529.31	81.72	38.12	12.00	7
California halibut	Central	PCBs	B13-8060	258.18	0.58	44513.79	5.84	1.44	405.56	109.76			
California halibut	Central	PCBs	B13-8078	165.19	0.37	44645.95	8.71	0.71	1226.76	36.39			
California halibut	Central	PCBs	SWHB-01	142.19	2.32	6129.09	5.67	0.88	644.32	9.51			
California halibut	Central	PCBs	SWHB-06	131.14	2.18	6015.44	2.62	0.35	748.57	8.04			
California halibut	Central	PCBs	SWHB-06	172.80	2.46	7024.21	2.62	0.35	748.57	9.38			
California halibut	Central	PCBs	SWHB-40	358.71	4.38	8189.72	4.23	0.62	682.26	12.00			
California halibut	Central	PCBs	SWHB-40	358.71	4.38	8189.72	4.23	0.62	682.26	12.00			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	PCBs	B13-8052	458.46	3.21	14282.24	3.07	0.58	529.31	26.98	37.32	37.16	6
Deepbody anchovy	Central	PCBs	B13-8052	457.99	3.25	14092.00	3.07	0.58	529.31	26.62			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	PCBs	B13-8052	456.16	3.20	14255.00	3.07	0.58	529.31	26.93			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	PCBs	B13-8060	261.10	1.36	19198.53	5.84	1.44	405.56	47.34			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	PCBs	B13-8060	243.18	1.26	19300.00	5.84	1.44	405.56	47.59			
Deepbody anchovy	Central	PCBs	B13-8060	261.48	1.33	19660.15	5.84	1.44	405.56	48.48			
Shiner perch	Central	PCBs	SWHB-01	94.82	10.26	924.14	5.67	0.88	644.32	1.43	4.53	4.53	2
Shiner perch	Central	PCBs	SWHB-40	323.26	6.22	5197.12	4.23	0.62	682.26	7.62			

Table C2. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Lipid (% ww)	Lipid normalized tissue (ng ww/g lipid)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	TOC (% dw)	TOC normalized sediment (ng/g OC dw)	Normalized BSAF (ng ww/g lipid) / (ng/g OC dw)	Mean	Median	Count
Slough anchovy	Central	PCBs	B13-8052	227.82	0.94	24236.17	3.07	0.58	529.31	45.79	44.01	45.73	8
Slough anchovy	Central	PCBs	B13-8052	224.80	0.93	24172.04	3.07	0.58	529.31	45.67			
Slough anchovy	Central	PCBs	B13-8052	217.52	1.07	20328.97	3.07	0.58	529.31	38.41			
Slough anchovy	Central	PCBs	B13-8060	273.97	1.13	24245.13	5.84	1.44	405.56	59.78			
Slough anchovy	Central	PCBs	B13-8060	243.06	1.07	22715.89	5.84	1.44	405.56	56.01			
Slough anchovy	Central	PCBs	B13-8060	281.29	1.22	23056.56	5.84	1.44	405.56	56.85			
Slough anchovy	Central	PCBs	SDC1	290.55	1.42	20461.27	7.09	0.90	790.44	25.89			
Slough anchovy	Central	PCBs	SDC3	322.02	1.72	18722.09	7.09	0.90	790.44	23.69			
Spotted sand bass	Central	PCBs	B13-8060	342.16	1.66	20612.05	5.84	1.44	405.56	50.82	18.07	11.17	5
Spotted sand bass	Central	PCBs	B13-8078	148.49	0.76	19538.16	8.71	0.71	1226.76	15.93			
Spotted sand bass	Central	PCBs	SWHB-01	570.60	7.93	7195.51	5.67	0.88	644.32	11.17			
Spotted sand bass	Central	PCBs	SWHB-06	358.84	6.86	5230.86	2.62	0.35	748.57	6.99			
Spotted sand bass	Central	PCBs	SWHB-40	181.38	4.89	3709.14	4.23	0.62	682.26	5.44			
Topsmelt	Central	PCBs	SDC1	251.15	1.20	20929.17	7.09	0.90	790.44	26.48	22.00	23.11	3
Topsmelt	Central	PCBs	SDC2	147.89	1.14	12972.81	7.09	0.90	790.44	16.41			
Topsmelt	Central	PCBs	SDC3	195.48	1.07	18269.16	7.09	0.90	790.44	23.11			
Arrow goby	South	PCBs	SDS2/3	98.30	4.15	2368.67	4.95	0.95	520.42	4.55	4.55	4.55	1
Barred sand bass	South	PCBs	B13-8017	100.97	1.44	7011.81	4.96	1.51	328.48	21.35	18.71	21.35	3
Barred sand bass	South	PCBs	B13-8020	81.38	0.91	8942.86	11.78	1.65	713.94	12.53			
Barred sand bass	South	PCBs	B13-8029	130.66	1.35	9678.52	6.57	1.51	435.10	22.24			
California halibut	South	PCBs	B13-8020	161.26	0.77	20942.86	11.78	1.65	713.94	29.33	14.78	8.39	6
California halibut	South	PCBs	B13-8029	161.88	1.10	14716.36	6.57	1.51	435.10	33.82			
California halibut	South	PCBs	SWHB-15	67.95	2.79	2435.58	1.81	0.63	287.30	8.48			
California halibut	South	PCBs	SWHB-21	171.49	3.29	5212.36	2.08	0.23	904.35	5.76			
California halibut	South	PCBs	SWHB-21	190.68	2.54	7507.21	2.08	0.23	904.35	8.30			
California halibut	South	PCBs	SWHB-22	109.47	2.46	4449.85	10.36	0.70	1480.00	3.01			
California killifish	South	PCBs	SDS2	38.40	1.77	2169.49	4.95	0.95	520.42	4.17	6.62	6.62	2
California killifish	South	PCBs	SDS3	97.67	2.07	4718.36	4.95	0.95	520.42	9.07			
Deepbody anchovy	South	PCBs	B13-8017	90.55	0.86	10529.07	4.96	1.51	328.48	32.05	29.60	28.16	5
Deepbody anchovy	South	PCBs	B13-8020	175.62	1.18	14883.05	11.78	1.65	713.94	20.85			
Deepbody anchovy	South	PCBs	B13-8020	201.03	1.00	20103.00	11.78	1.65	713.94	28.16			
Deepbody anchovy	South	PCBs	B13-8020	110.98	0.72	15413.89	11.78	1.65	713.94	21.59			
Deepbody anchovy	South	PCBs	B13-8029	171.62	0.87	19726.44	6.57	1.51	435.10	45.34			

Table C2. Continued.

Common Name	Region	Analyte	Station	Tissue (ng/g ww)	Lipid (% ww)	Lipid normalized tissue (ng ww/g lipid)	Sediment (ng/g dw)	TOC (% dw)	TOC normalized sediment (ng/g OC dw)	Normalized BSAF (ng ww/g lipid) / (ng/g OC dw)	Mean	Median	Count
Northern anchovy	South	PCBs	SDS2	208.47	1.67	12483.23	4.95	0.95	520.42	23.99	26.11	26.11	2
Northern anchovy	South	PCBs	SDS3	230.72	1.57	14695.54	4.95	0.95	520.42	28.24			
Round stingray	South	PCBs	B13-8017	418.67	5.00	8373.40	4.96	1.51	328.48	25.49	25.49	25.49	1
Shiner perch	South	PCBs	SWHB-22	85.51	7.09	1206.04	10.36	0.70	1480.00	0.81	0.81	0.81	1
Slough anchovy	South	PCBs	B13-8020	202.72	1.14	17782.46	11.78	1.65	713.94	24.91	16.80	16.80	2
Slough anchovy	South	PCBs	SWHB-15	197.15	7.90	2495.57	1.81	0.63	287.30	8.69			
Spotted sand bass	South	PCBs	SWHB-15	259.54	5.84	4444.14	1.81	0.63	287.30	15.47	6.99	4.51	3
Spotted sand bass	South	PCBs	SWHB-21	294.75	7.23	4076.82	2.08	0.23	904.35	4.51			
Spotted sand bass	South	PCBs	SWHB-22	154.45	10.43	1480.85	10.36	0.70	1480.00	1.00			
Topsmelt	South	PCBs	SDS1	134.29	1.00	13429.00	4.95	0.95	520.42	25.80	19.36	16.45	3
Topsmelt	South	PCBs	SDS2	69.34	0.81	8560.49	4.95	0.95	520.42	16.45			
Topsmelt	South	PCBs	SDS3	92.24	1.12	8235.71	4.95	0.95	520.42	15.83			

APPENDIX D. REFERENCE VALUE SELECTION

Background on thresholds for concentrations in eggs

Contaminant levels measured in seabird eggs collected for this study were compared with levels associated with adverse effects in other studies of avian species. The amount of information on effect levels is variable, depending on the contaminant, and some may be field-based while others are laboratory-based. Effect levels may vary with species and effect, and often there are no data on effect levels for the species being studied. Consequently, contaminant levels reported for least terns, cormorants, Caspian terns and western gulls in this study were compared with both a No Observed Adverse Effect Concentrations (NOAEC) and ranges of Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Concentrations (LOAECs) for sensitive adverse effects relating to maintenance of viable populations (i.e., survival, growth and reproduction). Low ends of ranges were used for contaminants with multiple studies (and LOAECs) for an individual species, and as such are considered conservative estimates of thresholds for observed adverse effects in the species being tested. It is important to note that as derived, LOAECs are thresholds for sensitive adverse effects in chronically exposed sensitive species, and as such may overestimate risk to less sensitive species. Depending on available data, NOAECs are either known, or “bounded” (i.e., by a paired LOAEC) or estimated from a LOAEC. Bounded NOAECs were preferred, but in most cases only effect levels are reported. Consistent with approaches used by the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (e. g., USEPA 1995), and depending on the available data, LOAECs were adjusted downward using an uncertainty factor between 2 and 10, to obtain an estimate of a NOAEC, and by another factor between 2 and 10 for uncertainty about species differences in sensitivity. The fact that NOAECs are for use to evaluate risks to waterbirds in this assessment was also considered in the selection of adjustment factors. The NOAECs thus derived, are considered conservative estimates of concentrations below which no adverse effects are expected for birds in general, or waterbirds specifically, and therefore serve as "screening levels" for identifying contaminants of potential concern. Some values are based on data from very few studies and as such may change as more data become available. Ultimately, NOAEC-based thresholds are considered screening levels below which there is no concern, but above which further consideration may be required. The LOAEC-based thresholds provide perspective on the potential for an observed contaminant concentration to be associated with a measurable adverse effect.

Background on Toxicity Reference Values (TRVs; doses)

TRVs may be No Observed Adverse Effects Levels (NOAELs) or Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Levels (LOAELs) for specific effects. NOAELs and LOAELs are obtained from laboratory or field studies in which concentrations of the contaminant in the diet are reported. Dietary NOAELs and LOAELs reported in applicable studies are converted to NOAELs and LOAELs using food ingestion rates (g_{food}/d) reported in the study (if reported) or estimated using allometric regressions from Nagy (2001).

Readily available sources of TRVs were considered for use in this assessment. Initial consideration was given to TRVs developed by the U.S. Navy and EPA Region 9 Biological Technical Assistance Group (Navy/BTAG TRVs; DTSC/HERD 2000 and 2009), followed by TRVs identified by EPA for ecological risk-based soil screening levels (Eco-SSLs; EPA 2003). Both sets were developed using a consensus process with multiple agencies, entailed

comprehensive review of the available literature, and were subject to peer review. The Navy/BTAG TRVs were developed to provide consistency in the assessment of risks posed to wildlife at contaminated sites in California, while the TRVs for Eco-SSLs were developed to support ecological risk assessments in terrestrial habitats nationwide. Navy/BTAG identified two TRVs for each of several contaminants. A low end TRV (TRV-L) was developed to represent a lowest credible no adverse effect level (NOAEL), below which no observable adverse effect is expected for the wildlife receptor of concern. A high-end TRV (TRV-H) was identified as well. The TRV-H is a chronic LOAEL that falls in the middle of the range of LOAELs that were considered by Navy/BTAG and represents a daily dose rate beyond which adverse ecological effects are expected to occur. Only one TRV per receptor category was identified for Eco-SSLs. TRVs for Eco-SSLs are equal to the geometric mean of the NOAEL values for growth and reproductive effects. In cases where the geometric mean NOAEL is higher than the lowest bounded LOAEL for survival, growth or reproduction, the selected TRV is equal to the highest bounded NOAEL below the lowest bounded LOAEL. Both the Navy/BTAG and Eco-SSL TRVs have limitations. Most notably, values have been derived for only a few of contaminants considered in this assessment (i.e., mercury, PCBs and DDT), and, for some, more recent data and/or reviews provide further insight into species differences in sensitivity. In addition, studies used to derive TRVs for Eco-SSLs tend to be focused on terrestrial species. Therefore, while Navy/BTAG TRVs and Eco-SSL TRVs were the first considered, a number of alternate TRVs were derived as part of this assessment (using standard protocols) for contaminants lacking Navy/BTAG TRVs or for which there may be more recent applicable data.

The approach taken for selecting NOAELs and LOAELs was the same as that taken for identifying NOAECs and LOAECs for avian eggs. Selected TRVs include at least one NOAEL and at least one LOAEL for sensitive adverse effects relating to maintenance of viable populations (survival, growth, reproduction). The fact that LOAELs and NOAELs are being used to evaluate risks to waterbirds was considered in the selection of TRVs, and NOAELs and LOAELs from studies on waterbirds are noted if not included to provide context at least. For LOAEL-based TRVs, if multiple LOAELs were reported for a particular species exposed to a particular contaminant, the lowest of the LOAELs was considered along with lowest LOAELs for other species when deciding which to use for the risk assessment. Appropriate dose-response studies for most of the contaminants in this assessment are few in number, and LOAELs for at least two of the contaminants (PAHs and chlordanes) are from single studies. Lowest LOAELs of several are considered conservative estimates of thresholds for observable adverse effects in the species being tested, and in other species as well. The likelihood of observing adverse effects when lowest LOAEL is exceeded may still be low but increases as mid-range LOAELs (e.g., TRV-Hs) are approached. The extent to which a LOAEL based on only one study is conservative is unknown and those values are used with some caution.

For NOAELs, bounded values were preferred, but in most cases it was necessary to estimate NOAELs by adjusting a LOAEL downward by a factor between 2 and 10. Depending on the available data, additional adjustment factors between 2 and 10 were applied for uncertainty about species differences in sensitivity. Only studies using subchronic or chronic exposures were considered for TRVs, and results of those that were sub-chronic were adjusted by a factor between 2 and 10 for uncertainty about the level at which effects might occur with chronic exposure. Adopting the approach by Sample et al. (1996), studies with exposures spanning ten or more weeks were considered chronic. Studies in which exposures were less than ten weeks but

spanned critical periods in development (e.g., as embryos) were also considered chronic. The resulting NOAEL-based TRVs are intended to be conservative estimates of daily doses below which no adverse effects are expected for any birds, and specifically for waterbirds. As such, the NOAEL-based TRVs serve as "screening levels" for identifying contaminants of potential concern (COPCs). It is recognized that some values are based on data from very few studies and consequently are applied with caution. Ultimately, for this assessment, NOAELs are screening levels below which there is no concern, but above which further consideration may be required. The LOAELs selected for this assessment provide perspective on the potential for an observed contaminant dose rate to be associated with a measurable adverse effect.

Screening levels (NOAECs, LOAECs, NOAELs and LOAELs) selected for this assessment are summarized in Tables D1 and D2, and the basis for selections are presented by contaminant in the following sections.

Effects and thresholds for mercury

Mercury has a high potential for bioaccumulation and is biomagnified through food chains. In birds, the highest concentrations occur in species that eat fish or other birds (Eisler 1987b). Methylmercury is the most stable form of mercury and the most toxic to wildlife. It is also the predominant form in fish (ATSDR 1999). Ingested methylmercury is readily accumulated in avian tissues, and in females, it is readily transferred to eggs. Dietary exposure to mercury may result in death from neurotoxic effects, but at relatively low dietary concentrations it adversely affects growth, development, motor coordination, behavior, and reproduction. Reproductive effects include reduced fertility, clutch size, egg hatchability, and chick survival. The reproductive effects are the most common adverse effects related to mercury concentrations in eggs.

Mercury in eggs

Effect levels for mercury in avian eggs have been most recently reviewed by Scheuhammer et al. (2007) and Shore et al. (2011), and include data for multiple species. Values selected for use in this study of seabird eggs are a combination of general guidelines, as well as LOAECs and NOAECs for piscivorous avian species, specifically snowy egret (*Egretta thula*), common loon (*Gavia immer*), and common tern (*Sterna hirundo*) (as cited by Shore et al. 2011). Few adjustments to the LOAEC were deemed necessary, given the available data, particularly on piscivorous birds. The lowest LOAEC for fish eating birds (egret) was adjusted downward by a factor of three for an estimated NOAEC. The thresholds and screening values used to assess mercury concentrations in seabird eggs for this study are summarized in Table D1 at the end of this chapter.

Mercury TRVs (dietary dose)

The Navy/BTAG (DTSC/HERD 2009) developed a TRV-L and a TRV-H for avian species based on reproductive effects in multiple studies of chronically exposed mallards (as summarized by USEPA 1995). Data from the studies on mallards may be considered the most robust on dietary doses of mercury associated with adverse effects on functions that can be related to reproductive success, such as survival, growth and reproduction (USFWS 2003). For the lowest credible NOAEL (TRV-L), Navy/BTAG used a LOAEL adopted by USEPA (1995), adjusted downward by a factor of two, resulting in a daily dose rate of 39 ng_{mercury}/gBW-day. There was no

further adjustment for species differences in sensitivity, presumably because mallards are a sensitive species. Following a re-evaluation of benchmark studies on mallards and consideration of species differences in sensitivity, USFWS (2003) recommended the use of two NOAELs for assessing risk; 21 ng_{mercury}/gBW-day for less sensitive avian species (e.g., terns), and 7.0 ng_{mercury}/gBW-d for potentially more sensitive species (e.g., waterfowl and marsh birds). Zhang et al. (2013) provided an updated review of data on mercury toxicity to birds, and included results of more recent studies on white ibis (*Eudocimus albus*), common loon, and great egret (*Ardea alba*). Of the species considered by Zhang et al. (2013), white ibis was most sensitive, exhibiting adverse reproductive effects as described by Frederick and Jayasena (2010) when exposed to mercury at an estimated daily rate of 10 ng_{mercury}/gBW-d. The dose rate is a LOAEL which Zhang et al. (2013) adjusted downward by a factor of two to obtain an estimated NOAEL of 5.0 ng_{mercury}/gBW-d for white ibis. Zhang et al. (2013) also suggested an even lower (5th percentile) NOAEL for all effects in all avian species of 3.9 ng_{mercury}/gBW-day. The lowest NOAEL recommended by Zhang et al. (2013) was used for initial screening, but all three NOAELs (two from Zhang et al. 2013 and one from USFWS 2003) were considered in follow-up risk characterization.

The TRV-H recommended by DTSC/HERD (2009) was used to evaluate potential for observable adverse effects in this assessment. As defined by Navy/BTAG the TRV-H for mercury (180 ng_{mercury}/gBW-d) is a chronic mid-range LOAEL. The TRV-H is a LOAEL based on neurotoxicity and mortality in mallard chicks and by definition represents the mid-range LOAEL for all of the studies considered by Navy/BTAG (DTSC/HERD 2009). Compared with studies reviewed by Zhang et al. (2013) the TRV-H is in the middle of the range of lowest LOAELs for sensitive (e.g., immunological or reproductive) and/or severe effects (e.g., mortality) in all ten species for which there were data, and is 18 times greater than the LOAEL for reproductive effects in white ibis. All of the TRVs selected for assessing mercury risks to seabirds and waterfowl in this assessment are summarized in Table D2.

Effects and thresholds for DDT and metabolites

DDT is a legacy organochlorine pesticide that was manufactured and widely used between the early 1940s and 1972 for control of disease-carrying insects and insects on agricultural crops. Technical grade DDT is primarily a mix of *p,p'*-DDT (85%), and *o,p'*-DDT (15%). However, once introduced into the environment and detected in environmental media, DDT is found as a mixture with its principal metabolites DDD and DDE, and is that mixture of components that is associated with adverse environmental effects (ATSDR 2002, Blus 2011). While DDT and its metabolites are typically found together, and consequently referred to collectively as total DDT, DDE is the most common form found in avian tissues. DDT and its metabolites are persistent and have a high potential for bioaccumulation and biomagnification. Highest concentrations in aquatic food webs occur in mammals and in birds that consume fish or other birds (USDOI 1998). When ingested by birds, DDT and metabolites may accumulate in bird tissues, and they are readily transferred to eggs by the female parent. Dietary exposure by birds to DDT may result in death, reproductive impairment, reduced fledging success and eggshell thinning. In birds, the most common, and possibly most sensitive adverse reproductive effect associated with exposure to DDT, and especially its metabolite DDE, is eggshell thinning. Eggshell thinning may in turn lead to crushed eggs and nest failure.

DDTs in Eggs

Studies associating DDT concentrations in eggs with adverse effects have been conducted on numerous avian species (USDOJ 1998, Blus 2011). Sensitivity to DDT can be highly variable depending on the species and the effect. USDOJ (1998) and Blus (2011) provide ranges of thresholds for population-level effects and eggshell thinning with breakage in several avian species. The lowest threshold concentration for each species was used to rank species from most sensitive to least sensitive, and ranges were identified based on percentile rankings. The estimated NOAEC is based on the lowest threshold for sensitive species adjusted downward by a factor of three. Low-end thresholds (LOAECs) selected from the review by Blus (2011) for evaluating DDT levels in seabird eggs, with a focus on reduced productivity and critical eggshell thinning (18%), are summarized in Table D1.

DDT TRVs (dietary dose)

The Navy/BTAG (DTSC/HERD 2009) developed a TRV-L and a TRV-H for total DDTs (tDDT) in avian species, as derived by USEPA (1995). The TRVs were derived from results of studies on multiple species of chronically and sub-chronically exposed birds, including chickens, quail, pheasant, mallard, black duck, American kestrel, bald eagles and pelicans (USEPA 1995). The TRV-L is based on a LOAEL of 27 ng_{tDDTs}/gbw-day for reduced productivity (nest success) in chronically exposed brown pelican, based on studies by Anderson et al. (1975 and 1977). The brown pelican is one of the most sensitive of the bird species on which chronic exposure studies have been conducted (Blus 2011), so that adjustments for uncertainty about species differences in sensitivity were deemed unnecessary. The LOAEL for effects in pelicans was adjusted downward by a factor of three to obtain an estimated NOAEL of 9.0 ng_{tDDTs}/gbw-d (USEPA 1995).

The NOAEL-based TRV selected by USEPA (2007a) for calculating soil screening levels is 227 ng_{tDDTs}/gbw-d, and is the highest bounded NOAEL lower than the lowest bounded LOAEL for reproduction, growth, and survival in studies on 22 species of birds. The selected TRV is for reduced growth in domestic chickens, an upland species, but is below LOAELs for growth, reproduction and survival for mallards, black duck, double-crested cormorants, white pelicans in addition to multiple upland and raptor species. Studies on brown pelican were not factored in to the analysis by EPA (2007a). Consequently, the TRV selected by EPA (2007a) is considered a low-end for all but most sensitive avian species.

The TRV-H recommended by DTSC/HERD (2009) was used to evaluate potential for observable adverse effects in this assessment. The TRV-H of 1,500 ng_{tDDTs}/gbw-d is equal to a geometric mean of LOAELs identified by USEPA (1995) for eggshell thinning, reduced reproductive success and/or lethality in seven species of chronically exposed birds. For soil screening levels, EPA (2007a) evaluated results of dietary studies on 22 avian species, including mallards, American black duck, double-crested cormorant and white pelican. In their review, EPA (2007a) identified 112 LOAELs, and 123 NOAELs for effects on reproduction, growth and survival. The TRV-H adopted by Navy/BTAG (DTSC/HERD 2009) is greater than approximately one-third of all LOAELs, and approximately one-half of bounded LOAELs considered by EPA (2007a), and as such is clearly a mid-range LOAEL. All of the TRVs selected for assessing DDT risks to seabirds and waterfowl in this assessment are summarized in Table D2.

Effects and thresholds for total PCBs, PCB 126 and TEQs

PCBs constitute a synthetic mixture of up to 209 individual congeners. PCB mixtures were used extensively as coolants and lubricants in transformers, capacitors and other electrical equipment. PCB manufacture and uses of all kinds were banned in 1979, due to evidence of their persistence and environmental impacts. PCBs are still detected in environmental media worldwide (ATSDR 2000, Eisler 1986). PCBs are known to bioaccumulate and to biomagnify within the food chain, with highest concentrations occurring in mammals and in birds that consume fish (ATSDR 2000, Eisler 1986). Birds exposed to high levels of PCBs in the diet may exhibit signs of poisoning such as liver damage, morbidity, tremors and death. Sublethal levels of exposure disrupt normal growth patterns, reproduction, metabolism and behavior (Eisler 1986). Reproductive effects in adult birds include but are not limited to altered secondary sexual characteristics, reduced nest attentiveness, delayed egg laying, reduced clutch size and abnormal nest construction (Harris and Elliott 2011). In female birds, PCBs are readily transferred to eggs, where they may exert toxic effects on developing embryos. PCB-related effects associated with *in ovo* exposure to PCBs include deformities (embryo and hatchling), embryo lethality, cardiomyopathy, reduced hatching success, and reduced growth and survival of post-hatch nestlings (Harris and Elliott 2011, Carro et al. 2013). Sensitivity to total PCBs is highly variable depending on the species and the effect.

PCBs in Eggs

Harris and Elliott (2011) identified ranges of total PCB concentrations in eggs that are associated reduced hatching and/or fledging success (8 species), reduced productivity (3 species), and reduced parental care (2 species). Thresholds used to evaluate total PCB levels in seabird eggs from this study were selected using the low ends of ranges identified by Harris and Elliott (2011) for reproductive effects in high, intermediate and low sensitivity species. A NOAEC for all avian species ($100 \text{ ng}_{\text{tPCBs}}/\text{g}_{\text{egg}}\text{WW}$) is based on the lowest LOAEC for highly sensitive species, adjusted downward by a factor of ten for a LOAEC/NOAEC extrapolation. An additional NOAEC that is more specific to waterbirds was identified because risk to waterbirds may be greatly overestimated by screening levels based on highly sensitive species. The estimated NOAEC for waterbirds ($2,300 \text{ ng}_{\text{tPCBs}}/\text{g}_{\text{egg}}\text{fw}$) is based on a lowest LOAEC for terns, gulls and raptors, adjusted downward by a factor of ten for LOAEC/NOAEC extrapolation. Using NOAECs for both most sensitive species and waterbirds allows for some consideration of species that may fall between the two groups with respect to sensitivity. Multiple LOAECs were considered for this assessment. Those that were selected are the lowest in ranges identified by Harris and Elliott (2011) for high, intermediate and low sensitivity species. Thresholds used for total PCBs in this study on seabirds and waterfowl in this assessment are summarized in Table D1.

PCB 126 and TEQs in Eggs

PCB congeners with chlorines in the non- or mono-ortho position have dioxin-like toxicity, with varying potencies relative to the standard for dioxins, which is TCDD. Toxicity equivalent factors can be applied to all twelve of the congeners to estimate PCB-based TCDD equivalent concentrations (TEQs). The most potent congeners and dominant contributors to PCB's dioxin-like toxicity in avian eggs are PCB numbers 77, 81, 126 and 169. Some studies on PCB toxicity to birds have focused on individual PCB congeners, primarily PCB 126 and PCB 77. The response most often assessed with TCDD or dioxin-like PCB congeners is induction of enzymes that are mediated by the aryl hydrocarbon receptor (AhR). Enzyme induction is considered a

measure of exposure that most directly relates to toxic effects observed at the organismal level, and is the basis of the assigned TEFs. At the organismal level, the adverse effects associated with TCDD or dioxin-like PCB congeners in avian eggs include embryo edema, skeletal abnormalities including beak deformities, heart malformations, and embryo lethality (Harris and Elliott 2011, Carro et al. 2013). Along with total PCBs, Harris and Elliott (2011) identified effect ranges for PCB 126 and TCDD (and TEQs). Thresholds used to evaluate PCB126 and TEQ concentrations in seabird eggs were selected using the low ends of ranges identified by Harris and Elliott (2011) for effect thresholds associated with embryo lethality for high, intermediate and low sensitivity species. Estimated NOAECs were derived using the same factors as for total PCBs, and are summarized along with LOAECs in Table D1.

Data on potential thresholds for PCB# 77 are very limited, but where available, concentrations of PCB #77 associated with adverse effects are higher than corresponding effect levels of PCB # 126.

PCB TRVs (dietary dose)

The Navy/BTAG (DTSC/HERD 2009) developed TRVs for total PCBs. The TRV-L is 90 $\text{ng}_{\text{PCB}}/\text{g}_{\text{BW-d}}$ and is based on a LOAEL for reduced egg production and egg fertility in chronically exposed leghorn chickens (Platonow and Reinhart 1973). The TRV-H is 1,270 $\text{ng}_{\text{PCB}}/\text{g}_{\text{BW-d}}$ and is a LOAEL based on reduced hatchability of eggs produced by exposed chickens (Britton and Huston 1973, as described by USEPA 1995). Specific details of how the Navy/BTAG-TRVs were derived are not provided. However, using exposure assumptions from Chiba (2014) for leghorn chickens, the BTAG TRV-L is an estimated NOAEL, based on a LOAEL adjusted downward by a factor of three. As defined, the TRV-H is a LOAEL that falls in the middle of the range of LOAELs considered by Navy/BTAG (DTSC/HERD 2009), as well as for LOAELs considered by USEPA (2000) and Su et al. (2014) for impacts on nine species of birds. The mallard is the only aquatic-dependent species represented in the analysis by EPA (2000), or in other reviews of potential avian TRVs for total PCBs (e.g., Su et al. 2014). If, as in eggs, total PCBs in the diet are less toxic to seabirds and waterfowl than to gallinaceous species (e.g., chicken and pheasant), then the TRV-H may overestimate the likelihood of observable impacts of PCB exposure on aquatic-dependent avian species, such as those considered in this assessment. Unfortunately, the ability to derive alternative LOAEL-based TRVs more specific to seabirds is hampered by lack of applicable data. Consequently, only two TRVs were selected for use in the assessment of risk posed by total PCBs to San Diego Bay seabirds and waterfowl (Table D2).

Because data on dietary effect levels for PCBs 126 and 77 are limited, risks posed by dietary exposure to these two congeners were addressed in combination with ten other dioxin-like congeners as TEQs (below).

TEQ TRVs (dietary dose)

There are no Navy/BTAG or EPA ECO-SSL TRVs for TEQs, and studies on effects of dietary exposure to specific PCB congeners are few. Most studies of dietary exposure to PCBs have entailed the use of one or more commercial Aroclor mixtures (total PCBs). Relative contributions of the dioxin-like congeners for the most common Aroclors have been roughly characterized as $\text{ug}_{\text{TEQ}}/\text{g}_{\text{Aroclor}}$ by the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME 2001). Using a process adopted by CCME (2001), Su et al. (2014) converted results of diet

studies with Aroclor mixtures from NOAECs and LOAECs as total PCBs to NOAECs and LOAECs as TEQs. In so doing, Su et al. (2014) identified NOAECs and LOAECs as dietary TEQ concentrations for effects on growth, reproduction and/or survival in nine species of birds. Using the authors' exposure factors, NOAECs and LOAECs from Su et al. (2014) were converted to NOAELs and LOAELs for this assessment. The lowest NOAEL from the study by Su et al. (2014; 0.0011 ng_{TEQ}/gbw-day) is an adjusted lowest LOAEL (0.0060 ng_{TEQ}/gbw-day). The LOAEL (and estimated NOAEL) are from a study in which chickens experienced reductions in egg production and hatchability (Su et al. 2014). The exposure duration in the benchmark study is considered borderline chronic/subchronic. As is, the estimated NOAEL is 5-times lower than the lowest LOAEL for all species and 5-times lower than the lowest NOAEL identified by Su et al. (2014) for species other than chickens. Consequently, the estimated lowest NOAEL is considered conservative and was not adjusted for uncertainty about chronic/subchronic exposure.

Two LOAEL-based TRVs from the review by Su et al.(2014) were selected for assessing PCB TEQ risks to waterfowl and seabirds. For the species considered by Su et al. (2014), there is a 683-fold difference between the lowest LOAEL (for chicken) and the highest LOAEL (bobwhite quail). The lowest LOAEL for species other than chickens (0.0495 ng_{TEQ}/gbw-day), and a mid-range (geometric mean) LOAEL for all species (0.178 ng_{TEQ}/gbw-day) considered by Su et al. (2014) were selected for use as TRVs in this assessment. As is the case for total PCBs, the mallard is the only aquatic-dependent species represented in studies on growth or reproductive effects of subchronic or chronic exposure by birds to PCBs in the diet (e.g., Su et al. 2014; USEPA 1995; CCME 2001; USEPA 2000), and LOAELs for mallard tend to be at the upper end of the range of LOAELs for species that have been tested (Su et al. 2014; USEPA 2000). Consequently, the mid-range LOAEL selected for this assessment may overestimate the likelihood of observable impacts of PCB TEQ on waterfowl and seabirds in this assessment. The TRVs selected for assessing risks posed by dioxin-like PCB congeners (as TEQs) are summarized in Table D2.

Effects and thresholds for total PBDEs

PBDEs are flame-retardant chemicals that are added to many types of consumer products to reduce potential for burning. PBDEs came in to use in the 1970s as formulations of three products (i.e., penta-, octa-, and decabromodiphenyl ether). They are ubiquitous and persistent in environmental media (ATSDR 2004), which raised concerns that resulted in phasing out production and use of penta- and octa-BDEs in 2004/2005 and of deca-BDE in 2013 (USEPA 2014). Lower brominated PBDEs (e.g., penta-BDE) are known to bioaccumulate and biomagnify in aquatic food chains, with highest concentrations occurring in fish (e.g., Wan et al. 2008). Birds exposed to PBDE in the diet may experience changes in courtship behavior and delayed clutch initiation. Females may produce smaller eggs with thinner shells and low-weight embryos, for an overall reduction in hatching success (Fernie et al. 2009, Harris and Elliott 2011). In female birds, dietary PBDEs are readily transferred to eggs, where they may exert toxic effects on developing embryos and post-hatch offspring. Adverse effects associated with PBDE exposure by embryos include reduced pipping and hatching success, and reproductive impairments in male offspring (Fernie et al. 2009; Marteinson et al. 2010). There is limited evidence of altered blood thyroid hormone homeostasis and/or vitamin A stores, which in turn may affect development, immuno-competence, reproductive success and other physiological processes (Fernie et al. 2008, Fernie et al. 2009). However, the occurrence of thyroid

involvement, especially in wild birds is under debate (McKernan et al. 2009, Harris and Elliott 2011).

PBDEs in eggs

Studies relating PBDE levels in avian eggs to adverse effects are very few in number and effect levels have only been reached in studies on American kestrel. However, results of egg injection studies by McKernan et al. (2009) and Rattner et al. (2011) indicate that exposure levels associated with adverse reproductive effects in kestrels are not sufficient to cause similar effects in chickens, mallards or common tern, and therefore that American kestrel represents a sensitive species. The thresholds considered for use in this assessment are based on reduced pipping and hatching success for American kestrel in egg injection studies by McKernan et al. (2009), and for impaired reproductive behavior, reduced clutch size and fertility of eggs produced through pairings with males exposed to PBDEs via transfer from female parent to egg (Marteinson et al. 2010; Fernie et al. 2009). Results of the study by McKernan et al. (2009) provide both a bounded NOAEC (180 ngPBDE/g fw) and LOAEC (1,800 ngPBDE/g fw). Results of multigenerational studies suggest a LOAEC of 288 ngPBDE/g fw for multigenerational reproductive effects from exposure to PBDE (via parental transfer) as an embryo (Marteinson et al. 2010). Both sets of studies appear to involve a sensitive avian species and chronic exposure. The NOAEC from the egg injection study is about one-half the LOAEC from the multigenerational study, which is consistent with dose-response relationships for chronic exposure and sensitive effects (Sample et al. 1996). Consequently, the bounded NOAEC from McKernan et al. (2009) is considered suitable as an initial screening level for sensitive effects in avian species. At 288 ngPBDE/g fw, the LOAEC obtained by Fernie et al. (2009) and Marteinson et al. (2010) with embryos exposed to maternally transferred PBDEs is between the bounded NOAEC and LOAEC from egg injection studies (McKernan et al. 2009), and consequently is considered an accurate representation of a lowest LOAEC for reproductive effects in a sensitive avian species. Unfortunately, data on LOAECs for species other than American kestrel are lacking. However, results of egg injection studies by McKernan et al. (2009) and Rattner et al. (2011) indicate that the NOAECs for embryo survival and egg hatchability is greater than 5,900 ngPBDE/g fw for chickens and approximately 20,000 ngPBDE/g fw for mallards and common terns. Unfortunately, without actual LOAECs, it is not possible to assign a particular screening value for species other than the kestrel. The screening levels used to evaluate PBDE concentrations in seabird and waterfowl eggs for this study are summarized in Table D1, and given the available information, the screening levels are likely to overestimate risks to other species.

PBDE TRVs (dietary dose)

Studies on dietary exposure by birds to PBDEs are limited to the series by Fernie et al. (2008, 2009) and Marteinson et al. (2010) on American kestrel. All three studies are based on daily exposure by adult kestrels to 300 or 1,600 ngPBDEs/g_{diet} over a period preceding and through the nesting season. Directly exposed adults, and their offspring (exposed *in ovo*) were monitored for a variety of endpoints relating to survival, growth and reproduction. The lowest concentration used is a dietary LOAEC for impacts on reproductive behaviors and success in directly exposed adults and/or their offspring (Fernie et al. 2008 and 2009, Marteinson et al. 2010). The dietary LOAEC was converted to a LOAEL using a wet weight-based food ingestion rate of 0.31 g_{food}/g_{BW}-d for American kestrels from USEPA (1993), resulting in a LOAEL of 96.0 ngPBDE/g_{BW}-d. Unfortunately, data on NOAELs for dietary exposure to PBDEs are lacking.

Consequently, the LOAEL from studies by Fernie et al. (2008 and 2009) and Marteinson et al. (2010) was adjusted by a factor of ten producing an estimated NOAEL of 9.6 ng_{PBDE}/g_{BW-d} for reproductive effects in a sensitive avian species. The TRVs selected for assessing risks posed by PBDEs in this assessment are as summarized in Table D2. Absent more robust data on PBDE dose and response in avian species, the NOAELs and LOAELs used for PBDEs in this assessment are applied with extra caution.

Effects and thresholds for PFCs (PFOS)

PFCs are a family of man-made compounds that have been used extensively since the late 1940s in industrial, commercial and consumer applications, including as water, grease and soil repellents for textiles and paper products, industrial surfactants and emulsifiers, fire-fighting foams, aids in the manufacture of non-stick coatings, and in metal plating and cleaning (ATSDR 2015). PFCs are ubiquitous and persistent in environmental media. PFCs released into aquatic environments bioaccumulate and biomagnify in food web organisms, with highest concentrations occurring in tissues of birds that eat fish or other birds (ATSDR 2015, Houde et al. 2006). Once ingested, PFCs bind to protein albumin in blood and liver. In female birds, PFCs are readily transferred to eggs, in association with the albumin (ATSDR 2015). While all of the PFCs considered in this study have been detected in a range of biota (e.g., Sedlak and Greig 2012), PFOS is the predominant PFC found in wildlife tissues (Houde et al. 2006 and 2011). Consequently, studies on the potential toxicity of PFCs in wildlife have been focused on PFOS, and for birds, only in a few species. For birds, adverse effects associated with dietary exposure to PFOS include overt signs of poisoning (ruffled appearance, reduced reaction to stimuli, loss of coordination, weakness and death), and sublethal effects such as reduced body weight and impacts on testes in males (Newsted et al. 2005, Newsted et al. 2006). Adverse effects associated with PFCs in eggs include reduced hatching success, liver pathology, and altered immune function (DeWitt et al. 2012, Molina et al. 2006).

PFCs (PFOS) in eggs

Newsted et al. (2005) evaluated effect levels in eggs of northern bobwhite quail and mallard, while Molina et al. (2006) studied effect levels for domestic chicken. The LOAEC for hatchability in chickens (Molina et al. 2006) is lower than the LOAEC for hatchability in quail or mallards. However, the study by Molina et al. (2006) used egg injection, which may overestimate toxicity, while studies by Newsted et al. (2005) were diet-based and more representative of actual exposure. Using guidance from the European Commission and data from studies on northern bobwhite quail and mallard, Newsted et al. (2005) derived NOAECs and LOAECs for assessing risks posed by PFOS in eggs of top avian predators. The authors identified a LOAEC for offspring survival in the more sensitive of two species (bobwhite quail) and adjusted it downward by a factor of two for LOAEC to NOAEC extrapolation, combined with a factor of 30 for uncertainty on interspecies variation, endpoint extrapolation and laboratory-to-field extrapolation. Given the more direct applicability of the exposure route used, and the conservative uncertainty factors that were employed by Newsted et al. (2005), values derived by those authors, which were reported as µg/mL were used for this study on seabirds. Assuming a density of 1.0 g/mL for avian eggs, values from Newsted et al. (2005) were converted to a NOAEC of 1,000 ng_{PFOS}/g_{egg} ww and LOAEC of 62,000 ng_{PFOS}/g_{egg} ww (Table D1). Like PBDEs, absent more robust data on dose and response in avian species, the NOAECs and LOAECs used for PFOS in this assessment are applied with extra caution.

PFCs (PFOS) TRVs (dietary dose)

Food web samples were not analyzed for PFCs, and therefore TRVs were not developed for PFCs.

Effects and thresholds for chlordane

Chlordane is a legacy OC pesticide widely used as a pesticide for control of agricultural pests, termites, and residential lawn and garden pests. All uses of chlordane ceased in 1988 (ATSDR 1994). Technical chlordane is a mixture of more than 45 components, but mostly *cis*-chlordane, *trans*-chlordane, heptachlor, and *cis*- and *trans*-nonachlors (ATSDR 1994, Eisler 1990). Chlordane is persistent in the environment, and chlordane released into aquatic environments is bioaccumulated in aquatic food web organisms, but food web biomagnification may be low, except for marine mammals (Eisler 1990). Birds exposed to chlordanes in the diet will accumulate them, especially nonachlors and the metabolite, oxychlordane in tissues with high fat content. Adverse effects associated with ingestion of chlordanes are primarily intoxication (e.g., sluggishness, weight loss, panting and tremors) and death, believed to be due primarily to oxychlordane in the brain (Eisler 1990). In females, ingested chlordanes are readily transferred to eggs, with the nonachlors and oxychlordane dominating (e.g., Zeeman et al. 2008).

Chlordane in eggs

Unfortunately, data on chlordane effect levels in eggs are lacking (Elliott and Bishop 2011, Wiemeyer 1996). Consequently, while chlordanes are routinely detected in seabird eggs, there are no benchmarks for assessing the potential for adverse effects at observed concentrations.

Chlordane TRVs (dietary dose)

While ingestion of chlordane has been linked with lethality in numerous avian species in the field (Elliott and Bishop 2011), few studies have been conducted that provide dietary dose-response data on chlordane toxicity to birds. In most of the dietary dosing studies, the toxic responses (usually lethality) were related to chlordane concentrations in the brain (not diet) and dietary thresholds are not provided. Consequently, the TRVs used for this assessment are based on a single study by Stickel et al. (1983), in which the authors report dietary thresholds for survival in red-winged blackbirds. Stickel et al. (1983) exposed birds to chlordane mixture in the diet for 84 days over which lethality was observed among birds fed 50,000 ng_{chlordane}/g_{diet} but not at 10,000 ng_{chlordane}/g_{diet}. The dietary concentrations were converted to daily dose rates using a food ingestion rate of 0.14 g_{food}/g_{BW}-d, based on body weight for red-winged blackbirds from Stickel et al. (1983) and the allometric regression for omnivores from Nagy (2001). The resulting estimated dose rates are a NOAEL of 1,400 ng_{chlordane}/g_{BW}-d and a LOAEL of 7,000 ng_{chlordane}/g_{BW}-d for reduced survival (LOAEL). Based on acute lethality, the sensitivity of red-winged blackbirds to chlordane in the diet is comparable to that of Northern bobwhite, Japanese quail and ring-necked pheasant and may be slightly greater than that of European starlings and mallard, with overall effect levels ranging from 200,000 ng_{chlordane}/g_{diet} to 858,000 ng_{chlordane}/g_{diet} (Eisler 1990). The range of dietary concentrations associated with acute lethality is fairly narrow, and might be broader if other data on more species were available. Considering data on acute lethality in multiple species, but absent chronic data for other species, the red-winged blackbird is tentatively considered an average or more sensitive species to chlordane toxicity. At twelve weeks, the exposure duration for the study by Stickel et al. (1983) may be considered borderline

chronic, raising some uncertainty about effect levels under longer term exposure conditions. Given the borderline subchronic/chronic exposure duration and uncertainty about species differences in sensitivity, the NOAEL for effects on red-winged blackbirds was adjusted by a factor of nine (three for each type of uncertainty). The TRVs selected for assessing risks posed by chlordanes (as the sum of *cis*- and *trans*-chlordane, *cis*- and *trans*-nonachlor, and oxychlordane) are summarized in Table D2.

Being based on results of one study only, the TRVs selected to assess risks posed by exposure to chlordanes are applied with extra caution.

Effects and thresholds for PAHs

Polynuclear (aka polycyclic) aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) are a group of compounds formed during incomplete combustion of coal, petroleum products, wood, garbage and other organic materials. They are commonly found in materials such as asphalt used for road construction, crude oil, coal, coal tar pitch, creosote, and roofing tar. Consequently, PAHs are ubiquitous in environmental media, usually attached to particles in air, soil or sediment. There are thousands of PAH compounds, each differing in the number and position of aromatic rings, and in the type and position of substituents on the basic ring structure. Environmental concerns have been focused on those that range in size from two ring compounds (e.g., naphthalene) to seven ring compounds, and with few if any substitutions (alkyl group or other radical attached to the ring). PAHs in the 2 to 7 ring size range are divided into two categories as a means to address differences in physical/chemical properties that influence fate and toxicity. Those containing 2 or 3 rings are considered LPAHs and are typically associated with adverse effects such as narcosis, gastrointestinal inflammation, anemia, poor growth and impaired kidney function. The 4 to 7 ring compounds are HPAHs, and may have the same effects as LPAHs, but also many are demonstrably carcinogenic, mutagenic, or teratogenic (Eisler 1987a).

PAHs are relatively persistent in the environment. Once in an aquatic environment PAHs may be bioaccumulated by food web organisms, but with little to no biomagnification occurring. Greatest accumulations of PAHs occur in tissues of algae, mollusks and other species that are incapable of metabolizing PAHs (Eisler 1987a). In birds, PAHs absorbed from the diet are filtered by the liver, where they are rapidly metabolized and excreted. Because of their rapid metabolism, PAHs rarely accumulate to detectable levels in avian tissues. However, PAHs may be detected in livers, and other tissues of birds that live in moderate to highly contaminated sites (Malcom and Shore 2003; Albers and Loughlin 2003). Depending on the fraction, adverse effects associated with ingestion of PAHs include gastrointestinal inflammation, anemia, impaired kidney function, poor growth, depressed immune function, and decreased egg production and fertility. PAHs absorbed by female birds may be transferred to eggs. However it is difficult to discern if the low concentrations observed in wild eggs are from maternal transfer or from application to the shell by oiled feathers of the brooding parent. Adverse effects associated with PAH exposure by embryos include embryo lethality, liver necrosis, kidney lesions, edema, poor growth and teratogenicity (Malcom and Shore 2003).

PAHs in eggs

Avian eggs were not analyzed for PAHs in this study, and therefore screening levels for PAHs in eggs were not considered further.

PAHs TRVs (dietary doses)

Dose-response studies on exposure of wildlife to PAHs in the diet are typically focused on specific constituents, generally the most toxic, selected to represent PAH mixtures as a whole. Absent data for more precise approaches, results obtained with most toxic constituents are applied to entire mixtures with no consideration of the relative toxicity of less toxic compounds (e.g., USEPA 2007b).

Studies on chronic (or subchronic) exposure by birds to PAHs in the diet are very few in number (Douben 2003). Only two potentially relevant studies for deriving LPAH TRVs were located; one study on mallards (Patton and Dieter 1980) exposed to a mixture of LPAHs (controls and two treatment levels) and one study on Japanese quail exposed to naphthalene (controls and three treatment levels) (Klasing 2007). Patton and Dieter (1980) observed no effects on survival, growth or reproduction in mallards exposed to dietary LPAHs at any of the concentrations tested, resulting no LOAECs but an unbounded NOAEC $4,000 \mu\text{g}_{\text{LPAHs}}/\text{g}_{\text{diet}}$. Klasing (2007) monitored multiple physiological, survival, growth and reproductive endpoints in adult quail exposed over 14 weeks to naphthalene in the diet. Of the effects that are more readily related to population level impacts (survival, growth and reproduction), growth (as weight gain) was the most sensitive. Results from Klasing (2007) provide both a bounded dietary NOAEC ($30,000 \text{ ng}_{\text{naphthalene}}/\text{g}_{\text{diet}}$) and LOAEC ($48,000 \text{ ng}_{\text{naphthalene}}/\text{g}_{\text{diet}}$) for naphthalene effects on weight gain and food consumption by adult quail. Using the food ingestion rate measured by Klasing (2007; $0.098 \text{ g}_{\text{food}}/\text{g}_{\text{BW-d}}$), and assuming that naphthalene is typical of other LPAHs (EPA 2007b), the estimated NOAEL and LOAEL for effects of LPAHs on weight gain in quail are respectively $2,950 \text{ ng}_{\text{LPAHs}}/\text{g}_{\text{BW-d}}$ and $4,730 \text{ ng}_{\text{LPAHs}}/\text{g}_{\text{BW-d}}$. Data on chronic dietary exposure by other species to LPAHs are lacking. Consequently, the bounded NOAEL for weight gain in quail was adjusted by a factor of ten for uncertainty about species differences in sensitivity, resulting in an estimated NOAEL of $295 \text{ ng}_{\text{LPAHs}}/\text{g}_{\text{BW-d}}$ (Table D2).

Three potentially relevant studies for deriving HPAH TRVs for effects on survival, growth or reproduction were located; one study on Northern bobwhite quail exposed to Benz(a)anthracene (BaA) in the diet (Brausch et al. 2010), another of European starlings (adults and nestlings) exposed via gavage to 7,12-Dimethylbenz(a)anthracene (DMBA; Trust et al. 1994), and a third of two pigeon strains exposed via injection to Benzo(a)pyrene (BaP) or Benzo(e)pyrene (Hough et al. 1993). Brausch et al. (2010) observed no effects on survival, growth or reproduction in bobwhite quail exposed over two months to dietary BaA at any of the levels tested, which translates into an unbounded chronic dietary NOAEC of $11,500 \text{ ng}_{\text{BaA}}/\text{g}_{\text{food}}$ ($\sim 2,300 \text{ ng}_{\text{BaA}}/\text{g}_{\text{BW-d}}$) and no LOAEC. Some exposure levels were associated with biochemical effects and impacts on the liver, however. Trust et al. (1994) reported numerous biochemical and physiological responses to European starling adults and nestlings exposed for 6 days via gavage to DMBA. At the organismal level, which may be related to population level effects, the only observed effects from short term oral exposure to DMBA were reduced growth and impaired immune function in nestlings, for which there was a NOAEL of $2,000 \text{ ng}_{\text{DMBA}}/\text{g}_{\text{BW-d}}$, and a LOAEL of $20,000 \text{ ng}_{\text{DMBA}}/\text{g}_{\text{BW-d}}$. No effects were observed in adults exposed to doses as high as $60,000 \text{ ng}_{\text{DMBA}}/\text{g}_{\text{BW-d}}$. The 6-day exposure duration for studies on starlings is considered acute for adults, but may be considered chronic for developing nestlings. Hough et al. (1993) reported reproductive effects in two strains of pigeon exposed over a period of five months to BaP. The study by Hough et al. (1993) entailed weekly injections at one dose rate ($10,000 \text{ ng}_{\text{BaP}}/\text{g}_{\text{BW}}$ per

week or 1,430 ng_{BaP}/ng_{BW-d}) for up to five months. Observations were focused on histopathological and physiological alterations, but it was also noted that there was 100 percent infertility in female birds. Results of the study by Hough et al. (1993) are the basis of screening levels in this assessment because it entailed chronic exposure, and produced the lowest of the potential LOAELs, which is desirable for assessing risks associated with mixtures, and ensuring that risks to birds exposed during particularly sensitive stages in development (e.g., nestlings) are addressed. The LOAEL for reproductive impairments in pigeons was adjusted by a factor of ten for an estimated NOAEL. The estimated NOAEL was further adjusted by a factor of ten for uncertainty about species differences in sensitivity. Assuming BaP toxicity represents HPAHs in general (EPA 2007b), the LOAEL and estimated NOAEL for BaP were selected as TRVs for assessing risks posed to waterbirds and seabirds by dietary exposure to HPAHs in general (Table D2).

Table D1. Screening levels used to evaluate contaminant levels in seabird eggs collected from San Diego Bay colonies in 2013.

Mercury (egg hatchability, embryo mortality)			
NOAEC	300	estimated from LOAEC (egret)	Shore et al. 2011
LOAEC(s)	600	5 th percentile all species (<lowest LOAEC for all species)	Shore et al. 2011
	800	Low (snowy egret; field based)	Shore et al. 2011
	1,300	Mid (common loon; field based)	Shore et al. 2011
	3,700	High (common tern; field based)	Shore et al. 2011
DDTs (productivity, eggshell thinning)			
NOAEC	200	eggshell thinning	Blus 2011
	1,000	reduced productivity	Blus 2011
LOAEC(s) – prod.	3,000	sensitive species (brown pelican)	Blus 2011
	5,000	Mid-range (e. g. double-crested cormorant & Caspian tern)	Blus 2011
LOAEC(s) - thinning	600	Sensitive species (pelican)	Blus 2011
	10,000	Mid-range (e. g. double-crested cormorant)	Blus 2011
Total PCBs (productivity, parental behavior)			
NOAEC	100	Adjusted LOAEC for most sensitive species	Harris & Elliott 2011
	2,300	Adjusted LOAEC for waterbirds and raptors ¹	Harris & Elliott 2011
LOAEC(s)	1,000	Most sensitive species (chickens)	Harris & Elliott 2011
	6,000	Medium sensitivity species (perching birds)	Harris & Elliott 2011
	23,000	Low sensitivity species (terns, gulls raptors)	Harris & Elliott 2011
PCB 126 (embryo lethality)			
NOAEC	0. 11	Adjusted LOAEC for most sensitive species (chickens)	
	6. 5	Adjusted LOAEC seabirds and raptors	Harris & Elliott 2011
LOAEC(s)	1. 1	Highly sensitive species (chickens)	Harris & Elliott 2011
	24. 0	Medium sensitivity species (bobwhite quail)	Harris & Elliott 2011
	65. 0	Least sensitive species (cormorant, tern, raptor)	Harris & Elliott 2011
TEQ (embryo lethality)			
NOAEC	0. 018	Adjusted LOAEC for most sensitive species	Harris & Elliott 2011
	0. 4	Adjusted LOAEC for waterbirds	Harris & Elliott 2011
LOAEC(s)	0. 18	Highly sensitive species (chickens)	Harris & Elliott 2011
	1. 0	Medium sensitivity (pigeon, pheasant, quail)	Harris & Elliott 2011
	4. 0	Low sensitivity (cormorant, heron, wood duck)	Harris & Elliott 2011

Table D1. Continued.

PBDEs (egg hatchability, fertility of offspring)			
NOAEC	180	Bounded NOAEC sensitive species	McKernan et al. 2009
LOAEC(s)	288	sensitive species	McKernan et al. 2009
PFOS (offspring survival)			
NOAEC	1,000	Adjusted LOAEC for more sensitive of two species	Newsted et al. 2005
LOAEC(s)	62,000	More sensitive of two species (mallard less sensitive)	Newsted et al. 2005
Not done - Chlordanes (no data for screening levels) and PAHs (not analyzed in egg samples)			

1. all but most sensitive (chickens) (including terns, gull and raptors)

Table D2. Toxicity Reference Values (TRVs) - dose rates used to evaluate risks posed by contaminants in the diet to aquatic-dependent birds of San Diego Bay.

NOAEL/LOAEL	(ng/g_{BW}-d)	Contaminant (most sensitive effects)	Source
Mercury (reproduction, parental behavior, productivity)			
NOAEL	4.0	5 th percentile NOAEL all species	Zhang et al. 2013
	7.0	Sensitive species	USFWS 2003
	21	Less sensitive species (obligate piscivores – seabirds)	USFWS 2003
LOAEL	10	Most Sensitive species (ibis)	Zhang et al. 2013
	180	Mid-range (all species considered; based on mallard)	DTSC/HERD 2009
Total DDTs (based on productivity, survival and growth)			
NOAEL	9.0	most sensitive species (pelican)	DTSC/HERD 2009
	227	less sensitive species	EPA 2007a
LOAEL	27	most sensitive species	EPA 1995
	1,500	Mid-range all species	DTSC/HERD 2009
Total PCBs (based on egg production, fertility, and hatchability)			
NOAEL	90	Estimated for most sensitive species	DTSC/HERD 2009
LOAEL	1,270	Mid-range, all species (mostly non-waterbirds)	DTSC/HERD 2009
TEQ (based on egg production, hatchability)			
NOAEL	0.0011	Estimated, for most sensitive species (chickens)	Su et al. 2014
LOAEL	0.0495	Lowest for species other than most sensitive	Su et al. 2014
	0.178	Mid-range for all species considered (incl. mallards)	Su et al. 2014
PBDEs (reproductive behavior, egg quality, productivity)			
NOAEL	9.6	Adjusted LOAEL- sensitive species ¹	Fernie et al. 2009
LOAEL	96	Sensitive species ¹	Fernie et al. 2009
Chlordanes (survival)			
NOAEL	160	sensitive species ²	Stickel et al. 1983
LOAEL	7,000	Sensitive species ²	Stickel et al. 1983
LPAHs (weight and food consumption)			
NOAEL	295	Sensitive effect in species of unknown relative sensitivity	Klasing 2007
LOAEL	4,730	Sensitive effect in species of unknown relative sensitivity	Klasing 2007
HPAHs (infertility)			
NOAEL	14.3	Sensitive effect in species of unknown relative sensitivity	Hough et al. 1993
LOAEL	1,430	Sensitive effect in species of unknown relative sensitivity	Hough et al. 1993
1. Only kestrels, mallards and terns studied (mallards and terns \leq sensitivity of kestrels; Rattner et al. 2011)			

References

- Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR). 1994. Toxicological profile for chlordane. ATSDR, U. S. Public Health Service, Atlanta, Georgia. 262 pp.
- Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR). 1999. Toxicological profile for mercury. ATSDR, U.S. Public Health Service, Atlanta, Georgia. 676 pp.
- Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR). 2000. Toxicological profile for Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs). ATSDR, U.S. Public Health Service, Atlanta, Georgia. 948 pp.
- Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR). 2002. Draft toxicological profile for DDT, DDE and DDD. ATSDR, U.S. Public Health Service, Atlanta, Georgia. 497 pp.
- Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR). 2004. Draft toxicological profile for Polybrominated Biphenyls and Polybrominated Diphenyl Ethers. ATSDR, U.S. Public Health Service, Atlanta, Georgia. 619 pp.
- Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR). 2015. Draft toxicological profile for Perfluoroalkyls. ATSDR, U.S. Public Health Service, Atlanta, Georgia. 574 pp.
- Albers, P. H. and T. R. Loughlin. 2003. Effects of PAHs on marine birds, mammals and reptiles. pp 243-262 in: P. E. T. Douben (ed.) PAHs: an ecotoxicological perspective. John Wiley and Sons, Ltd., West Sussex, England. 406 pp.
- Anderson, D. W., J. R. Jehl, R. W. Risebrough, L. A. Woods, L. R. Deweese, and W. G. Edgecombe. 1975. Brown pelicans: improved reproduction off the southern California coast. *Science* 190:806-808.
- Anderson, D. W., R. M. Jurek, and J. O. Keith. 1977. The status of brown pelicans at Anacapa Island in 1975. *Calif. Fish and Game* 1:4-10.
- Blus, L.J. 2011. DDT, DDD and DDD in birds. In "Second Edition, Environmental Contaminants in Biota, Interpreting Tissue Concentrations." W.N. Beyer and J.P. Meador, eds. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida. pp. 425-444.
- Brausch, J.M., B.R. Blackwell, B.N. Beall, C. Caudillo, V. Kolli, C. Godard-Codding, S.B. Cox, G. Cobb and P.N. Smith. 2010. Effects of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in northern bobwhite quail (*Colinus virginianus*). *J. Toxicol. Environ. Health, Part A.* 73(8):540-551.
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control Human and Ecological Risk Division (DTSC/HERD). 2000. HERD ecological risk assessment (ERA) note Number 4. California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Sacramento CA.
<https://www.dtsc.ca.gov/AssessingRisk/upload/econote4.pdf>.
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control Human and Ecological Risk Division (DTSC/HERD). 2009. U. S. Navy and U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9

Biological Technical Assistance Group (Navy/BTAG) Toxicity Reference Values (TRVs) for Ecological Risk Assessment. February 24, 2009 update. Accessed <https://www.dtsc.ca.gov/AssessingRisk/eco.cfm>.

Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME). 2001. Canadian tissue residue guidelines for the protection of wildlife consumers of aquatic biota: Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, Winnipeg, Canada. 7 pp.

Carro, T., K. Dean and M.A. Ottinger. 2013. Effects of an environmentally relevant polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) mixture on embryonic survival and cardiac development in the domestic chicken. *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* 32(6):1325-1331.

Chiba, L. I. 2014. *Animal Nutrition Handbook*, Section 12 - Poultry Nutrition and Feeding. accessed from <http://www.ag.auburn.edu/~chibale/animalnutrition.html>.

DeWitt, J.C., M.M. Peden-Adams, J.M. Keller and D.R. Germolec. 2012. Immunotoxicity of perfluorinated compounds: Recent developments. *Toxicol. Pathology.* 40:300-311.

Douben, P.E.T. 2003. PAHs: An ecotoxicological perspective, P.E.T. Douben ed., John Wiley and Sons, Ltd., West Sussex, England. 406 pp.

Eisler, R. 1986. Polychlorinated Biphenyl hazards to fish, wildlife, and invertebrates: A synoptic review. Contaminant hazards reviews, Report No. 7. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Laurel, Maryland. 53 pp.

Eisler, R. 1987a. Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon hazards to fish, wildlife, and invertebrates: A synoptic review. Contaminant hazards reviews, Report No. 11. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Laurel, Maryland. 55 pp.

Eisler, R. 1987b. Mercury hazards to fish, wildlife, and invertebrates: A synoptic review. Contaminant hazards reviews, Report No. 10. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Laurel, Maryland. 63 pp.

Eisler, R. 1990. Chlordane hazards to fish, wildlife, and invertebrates: A synoptic review. Contaminant hazards reviews, Report No. 21. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Laurel, Maryland. 63 pp.

Elliott, J.E. and C.A. Bishop. 2011. Cyclodiene and other organochlorine pesticides in birds. In "Second Edition, Environmental Contaminants in Biota, Interpreting Tissue Concentrations" W.N. Beyer and J.P. Meador, eds. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida. pp. 447-475.

Fernie K.J., J.L. Shutt, R.J. Letcher, J.I. Ritchie, K. Sullivan and D.M. Bird. 2008. Changes in reproductive courtship behaviors of adult American kestrels (*Falco sparverius*) exposed to environmentally relevant levels of the polybrominated diphenyl ether mixture, DE-71. *Toxicol Sci* 102(1):171-178.

Fernie, K.J., J.L. Schutt, R.J. Lechter, I.J. Ritchie and D.M. Bird. 2009. Environmentally relevant concentrations of DE-71 and HBCD alter eggshell thickness and reproductive success of American kestrels. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 43(6):2124-2130.

Frederick P. and N. Jayasena. 2010. Altered pairing behaviour and reproductive success in white ibises exposed to environmentally relevant concentrations of methylmercury. *Proc R Soc B* 278:1851- 1857.

Harris, M.L. and J.E. Elliott. 2011. Effects of polychlorinated biphenyls, dibenzo-p-dioxins and dibenzofurans, and polybrominated diphenyl ethers in wild birds. In “Second Edition, Environmental Contaminants in Biota, Interpreting Tissue Concentrations” W. N. Beyer and J.P. Meador, eds. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida. pp. 477-528.

Houde, M., A.O. De Silva, D.C.G. Muir and R.J. Lechter. 2011. Monitoring of perfluorinated compounds in aquatic biota: An updated review. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 45(19):7962-7973.

Houde, M., J.W. Martin, R.J. Letcher, K.R. Solomon and D.C.G. Muir. 2006. Biological monitoring of polyfluoroalkyl substances: A Review. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 40(11):3463-3473.

Hough, J. L., M. B. Baird., G. T. Sfeir, C. S. Pacini, D. Darrow and C. Wheelock. 1993. Benzo(a)pyrene enhances atherosclerosis in white Carneau and show racer pigeons. *Arterioscler. Thromb Vasc Biol.* 13(12):1721-1727.

Klasing, K. C. 2007. Effects of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon (PAH) ingestion on Japanese quail. Final report. California Department of Fish and Game, Office of Spill Prevention and Response. Accessed from <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=20093>.

Malcom, H. M., and R. F. Shore. 2003. Effects of PAHs on terrestrial and freshwater birds, mammals and amphibians. pp. 225-242 in: P. E. T. Douben (ed.) PAHs: an ecotoxicological perspective. John Wiley and Sons, Ltd., West Sussex, England. 406 pp.

Martinson S. C., D. M. Bird, J. L. Shutt, R. J. Letcher, I. J. Ritchie, and K. J. Fernie. 2010. Multi-generational effects of polybrominated diphenylethers exposure: embryonic exposure of male American kestrels (*Falco sparverius*) to DE-71 alters reproductive success and behaviors. *Environ Toxicol Chem.* 29(8):1740–1747.

McKernan M.A., B.A. Rattner, R.C. Hale, and M.A. Ottinger. 2009. Toxicity of polybrominated diphenyl ethers (DE-71) in chicken (*Gallus gallus*), mallard (*Anas platyrhynchos*), and American kestrel (*Falco sparverius*) embryos and hatchlings. *Environ Toxicol Chem* 28(5):1007-1017.

Molina, E.D., R. Balander, S.D. Fitzgerald, J.P. Giesy, K. Kannan, R. Mitchell, and S.J. Bursian. 2006. Effects of cell injection of perfluorooctane sulfonate before incubation on development of the white leghorn chicken (*Gallus domesticus*) embryo. *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* 25:227-232.

Nagy, K.A. 2001. Food requirements of wild animals: Predictive equations for free-living mammals, reptiles, and birds. *Nutrition Abstracts and Reviews, Series B.* 71(10):21R-31R.

- Newsted, J. L., P.D. Jones, K. Coady and J.P. Giesy. 2005. Avian toxicity reference values for perfluorooctane sulfonate. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 39:9357-9362.
- Newsted, J.L., S.A. Beach, S. Gallagher, and J.P. Giesy. 2006. Pharmacokinetics and acute lethality of perfluorooctanesulfonate (PFOS) to the mallard and northern bobwhite. *Arch. Environ. Contam. Toxicol.* 50:411-420.
- Patton, J.F and M.P. Dieter. 1980. Effects of petroleum hydrocarbons on hepatic function in the duck. *Comp Biochem Physiol.*, Vol 65C:33-36.
- Platonow, N.S. and B.S. Reinhart, 1973. The effect of polychlorinated biphenyls Aroclor 1254 on chicken egg production, fertility, and hatchability. *Canadian Journal of Comparative Medicine*, 37:341-346.
- Rattner, B.A., R.S. Lazarus, G.H. Heinz, N.K. Karouna-Renier and R.C. Hale. 2011. Apparent tolerance of common tern (*Sterna hirundo*) embryos to a pentabrominated diphenyl ether mixture (DE-71). U.S. Geological Survey-Patuxant Wildlife Research Center, Beltsville, MD.
- Sample, B.E., D.M. Opresko, and G.W. Suter II. 1996. Toxicological Benchmarks for Wildlife: 1996 Revision. ES/ER/TM-86/R3, Health Sciences Research Division, Oak Ridge, TN.
- Scheuhammer, A.M., M.W. Meyer, M.B. Sandheinrich and M.W. Murray. 2007. Effects of environmental methylmercury on the health of wild birds, mammals and fish. *Ambio.* 36(1):12-18.
- Sedlak, M.D. and D.J. Greig. 2012. Perfluoroalkyl compounds (PFCs) in wildlife from an urban estuary. *J. Environ. Monit.* 14:146-154.
- Shore, R.F., M.G. Pereira, L.A. Walker and D.R. Thompson. 2011. Mercury in nonmarine birds and mammals. In "Second Edition, Environmental Contaminants in Biota, Interpreting Tissue Concentrations" W.N. Beyer and J.P. Meador, eds. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida. pp. 609-624.
- Stickel, L.F., W.H. Stickel, R.A. Dyrland, and D.L. Hughes. 1983. Oxychlorane, HCS-3260, and nonachlor in birds: lethal residues and loss rates. *Journal of toxicology and environmental health* 12:611-622.
- Su, H., F. Wu, R. Zhang, X. Ahao, Y. Mu, C. Feng and J.P. Giesy. 2014. Toxicity reference values for protecting aquatic birds in China from the effects of polychlorinated biphenyls. pp. 59-82 in D.M. Whiteacre (ed). *Reviews of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology* Volume 230, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-04411-8_3. Springer International Publishing Co. Switzerland.
- Trust, K.A., A. Fairbrother and M.J. Hooper. 1994. Effects of 7,12-dimethylbenz(a)anthracene on immune function and mixed-function oxygenase activity in the European starling. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry.* 13(5): 821.

U.S. Department of the Interior (USDOI). 1998. Guidelines for the interpretation of the biological effects of selected constituents in biota, water, and sediment. National Irrigation Water Quality Program. Information Report 3. Bureau of Reclamation, Denver, Colorado. 198 pp.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 1993. Wildlife exposure factors handbook, Volume I of II. EPA/600/R-93/187. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Washington, D.C. 572 pp.

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 1995. Great Lakes water quality initiative criteria documents for the protection of wildlife - DDT, Mercury, 2,3,7,8-TCDD and PCBs. EPA-820-B-95-008. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Washington, D.C. 82 pp.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) 2000. Phase 2 Report - Further characterization and analysis, Volume 2E - Revised baseline ecological risk assessment, Hudson River PCBs reassessment. November 2000. Report by TAMs Consultants, Inc. and Menzie-Curra and Associates, Incorporated for USEPA, R2 and USACOE, Kansas City District. Books 1 (text) and 2 (tables).

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2003. Guidance for developing ecological soil screening levels. OSWER Directive 9285.7-55. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response. Washington, D. C.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2007a. Ecological soil screening levels for DDT and metabolites. OSWER Directive 9285. 7-57. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response. Washington, D. C.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2007b. Ecological soil screening levels for polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) - interim final. OSWER Directive 9285. 7-78. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response. Washington, D. C.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2014. Technical Fact Sheet - Polybrominated Diphenyl Ethers (PBDEs) and Polybrominated Biphenyls (PBBs). EPA-505-F-14-006. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2003. Evaluation of the Clean Water Act Section 304(a) human health criterion for methylmercury: protectiveness for threatened and endangered wildlife in California. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office, Environmental Contaminants Division. Sacramento, California. 96 pp + appendix.

Wan, Y., H. Jianying, K. Zhank and L. An. 2008. Trophodynamics of polybrominated diphenyl ethers in the marine food web of Bohai Bay, North China. *Environ. Sci Technol.* 42(4):1078-183.

Wiemeyer, S.N. 1996. Other organochlorine pesticides in birds. In "Environmental Contaminants in Wildlife, Interpreting Tissue Concentrations." W.N. Beyer, G.H. Heinz and

A.W. Redmon-Norwood, eds. Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, Special Publications Series. Lewis Publishers, Boca Raton, Florida. pp. 99-115.

Zeeman, C., S.K. Taylor, J. Gibson, A. Little, and C. Gorbics. 2008. Characterizing exposure and potential impacts of contaminants on seabirds nesting at South San Diego Bay Unit of the San Diego National Wildlife Refuge (Salt Works, San Diego Bay) - Final Report. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office, Carlsbad, California. 53 pp.

Zhang, R., F. Wu, H. Li, G. Guo, C. Feng, J.P. Giesy and H. Chang. 2013. Toxicity reference values and tissue residue criteria for protecting avian wildlife exposed to methylmercury in China. pp. 53-80 in D. M. Whiteacre (ed). Reviews of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology, Volume 223, DOI 10. 1007/978-1-4614-5577-6_3, Springer International Publishing Co., Switzerland.

APPENDIX E. RISK CHARACTERIZATION - INITIAL SCREEN TABLES

Table E1. Summary data on concentrations of mercury in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay, with exceedances/no exceedances (+, ++, or -) of observed effect-based dietary screening levels (NOAECs; SLs) marked for avian receptor groups represented by Surf scoter (1), California least tern (2), Caspian tern (3), Double-crested cormorant (4) and Western gull (5).

Mercury	N	Mean	StdDev	Max	SLs	benthic feeding waterfowl ¹	small pelagic piscivore ²	large pelagic piscivore ³	large piscivore pelagic/demersal/benthic ⁴	generalist aquatic/non-aquatic ⁵
	N	Mean	StdDev	Max	SLs	13	5	9	13.5	25
Arrow goby	1	46	NA	46		++	++	++	++	++
Barred sand bass	9	67	9	87		++	++	++	++	++
Spotted sand bass	1	94	30	154		++	++	++	++	++
Deepbody anchovy	1	49	36	109		++	++	++	++	++
Northern anchovy	1	35	NA	35		++	++	++	++	++
Slough anchovy	9	29	9	46		++	++	++	++	++
Black perch	2	19	7	23		++	++	++	++	-
Shiner perch	6	27	12	46		++	++	++	++	++
California halibut	2	54	45	239		++	++	++	++	++
California killifish	2	26	0	26		++	++	++	++	++
Topsmelt	9	32	16	62		++	++	++	++	++
Round stingray	1	151	NA	151		++	++	++	++	++
Brown shrimp	2	35	8	41		++	++	++	++	++
Crabs	1	12	NA	12		-	++		-	-
Crustacea	1	33	10	55		++	++	++	++	++
Mollusks	1	40	22	88		++	++	++	++	++
Polychaetes	1	99	106	429		++	++	++	++	++
Plankton	9	25	21	72		++	++	++	++	+

- no exceedances

+ screening level exceeded by maximum

++ screening level exceeded by maximum and mean

Table E2. Summary data on concentrations of total DDTs in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay, with exceedances/no exceedances (+, ++, or -) of observed effect-based dietary screening levels (NOAECs; SLs) marked for avian receptor groups represented by Surf scoter (1), California least tern (2), Caspian tern (3), Double-crested cormorant (4) and Western gull (5).

DDTs	Concentrations (ng/g ww)				SLs →	benthic feeding waterfowl ¹	small pelagic piscivore ²	large pelagic piscivore ³	large piscivore pelagic/demersal/benthic ⁴	generalist aquatic/non-aquatic ⁵
	N	Mean	StdDev	Max						
Sample type	N	Mean	StdDev	Max	SLs →	29	11	21	30	57
Arrow goby	1	0.050	NA	0.050		-	-	-	-	-
Goby sp.	3	10.6	0.29	10.9		-	-	-	-	-
Barred sand bass	9	16.1	10.4	40.3		+	++	+	+	-
Spotted sand bass	11	10.8	3.7	16.0		-	+	-	-	-
Deepbody anchovy	11	20.8	14.8	46.4		+	++	++	+	-
Northern anchovy	2	8.9	1.0	9.6		-	-	-	-	-
Slough anchovy	10	12.2	7.1	30.9		+	++	+	+	-
Black perch	2	13.3	9.7	20.1		-	++	-	-	-
Shiner perch	6	14.5	6.7	22.1		-	++	+	-	-
California halibut	20	11.7	6.9	37.7		+	++	+	+	-
California killifish	2	6.5	6.7	11.2		-	-	-	-	-
Topsmelt	9	6.8	3.0	11.7		-	+	-	-	-
Round stingray	1	0.6	NA	0.55		-	-	-	-	-
Brown shrimp	2	2.4	1.1	3.2		-	-	-	-	-
Crabs	1	5.1	NA	5.1		-	-	-	-	-
Crustacea	13	6.1	5.5	21.5		-	+	+	-	-
Mollusks	11	6.1	9.5	33.1		+	+	+	+	-
Polychaetes	18	7.1	4.6	21.5		-	+	+	-	-

- no exceedances

+ screening level exceeded by maximum

++ screening level exceeded by maximum and mean

Table E3. Summary data on concentrations of PCBs (Σ Bight'13 congeners) in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay, with exceedances/no exceedances (+, ++, or -) of observed effect-based dietary screening levels (NOAECs; SLs) marked for avian receptor groups represented by Surf scoter (1), California least tern (2), Caspian tern (3), Double-crested cormorant (4) and Western gull (5).

ΣPCB congeners*		Concentrations (ng/g ww)				benthic feeding waterfowl ¹	small pelagic piscivore ²	large pelagic piscivore ³	large piscivore pelagic/demersal/benthic ⁴	generalist aquatic/non-aquatic ⁵
		N	Mean	StdDev	Max					
Sample Type	N	Mean	StdDev	Max	SLs →	288	110	207	303	566
Arrow goby	1	98	NA	98		-	-	-	-	-
Goby sp.	3	216	143	327		+	++	++	+	-
Barred sand bass	9	191	92	369		+	++	+	+	-
Spotted sand bass	11	289	132	571		++	++	++	+	
Deepbody anchovy	11	263	137	458		+	++	++	+	-
Northern anchovy	2	220	16	231		+	++	++	-	-
Slough anchovy	10	248	42	322		+	++	++	+	-
Black perch	2	239	272	432		+	++	++	+	-
Shiner perch	6	175	145	388		+	++	+	+	-
California halibut	20	176	76	359		+	++	+	+	-
California killifish	2	68	42	98		-	-	-	-	-
Topsmelt	9	148	60	251		-	++	+	-	-
Round stingray	1	419	NA	419		++	++	++	++	-
Brown shrimp	2	28	29	48		-	-	-	-	-
Crabs	1	14	NA	14		-	-	-	-	-
Crustacea	13	91	54	169		-	+	-	-	-
Mollusks	11	44	51	169		-	+	-	-	-
Polychaetes	18	122	63	283		-	++	+	-	-
Plankton	13	59	47	169		-	+	-	-	-

- no exceedances

+ screening level exceeded by maximum

++ screening level exceeded by maximum and mean

* Total PCB concentrations will be higher by a factor of ~1.27

Table E4. Summary data on concentrations of PCB TEQs in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay, with exceedances/no exceedances (+, ++, or -) of observed effect-based dietary screening levels (NOAECs; SLs) marked for avian receptor groups represented by Surf scoter (1), California least tern (2), Caspian tern (3), Double-crested cormorant (4) and Western gull (5).

PCB TEQs	N	Concentrations (ng/g ww)				benthic feeding waterfowl ¹	small pelagic piscivore ²	large pelagic piscivore ³	large piscivore pelagic/demersal/benthic ⁴	generalist aquatic/non-aquatic ⁵
		Mean	StdDev	Max	SLs→					
Sample type	N	Mean	StdDev	Max	SLs→	0.0035	0.0014	0.0025	0.004	0.0069
Arrow goby	1	0.0064	NA	0.0064		++	++	++	++	-
Goby sp.	3	0.0099	0.0037	0.0137		++	++	++	++	++
Barred sand bass	9	0.0294	0.0110	0.0528		++	++	++	++	++
Spotted sand bass	11	0.0231	0.0317	0.1169		++	++	++	++	++
Deepbody anchovy	11	0.0645	0.0327	0.1140		++	++	++	++	++
Northern anchovy	2	0.0065	0.0000	0.0065		++	++	++	++	-
Slough anchovy	10	0.0234	0.0346	0.1125		++	++	++	++	++
Black perch	2	0.0278	0.0295	0.0486		++	++	++	++	++
Shiner perch	6	0.0155	0.0113	0.0334		++	++	++	++	++
California halibut	20	0.0435	0.0395	0.1315		++	++	++	++	++
California killifish	2	0.0067	0.0004	0.0070		++	++	++	++	+
Topsmelt	9	0.0075	0.0007	0.0086		++	++	++	++	++
Round stingray	1	0.0111	NA	0.0111		++	++	++	++	++
Brown shrimp	2	0.0064	0.0001	0.0065		-	-	-	-	-
Crabs	1	0.0063	NA	0.0063		-	-	-	-	-
Crustacea	13	0.0075	0.0016	0.0115		+	+	+	+	++
Mollusks	11	0.0064	0.0001	0.0067		++	++	++	++	-
Polychaetes	18	0.0069	0.0009	0.0097		++	++	++	++	++
Plankton	13	0.0065	0.0004	0.0075		++	++	++	++	+

- no exceedances

+ screening level exceeded by maximum

++ screening level exceeded by maximum and mean

Table E5. Summary data on concentrations of PBDEs in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay, with exceedances/no exceedances (+, ++, or -) of observed effect-based dietary screening levels (NOAECs; SLs) marked for avian receptor groups represented by Surf scoter (1), California least tern (2), Caspian tern (3), Double-crested cormorant (4) and Western gull (5).

PBDEs	Concentrations (ng/g ww)					benthic feeding waterfowl ¹	small pelagic piscivore ²	large pelagic piscivore ³	large piscivore pelagic/demersal/benthic ⁴	generalist aquatic/non-aquatic ⁵
	N	Mean	StdDev	Max	SLs					
Arrow goby	1	20	NA	20		-	++	-	-	-
Goby sp.	3	3.1	1.7	5.0		-	-	-	-	-
Barred sand bass	9	3.6	2.4	8.2		-	-	-	-	-
Spotted sand bass	11	1.2	0.9	3.4		-	-	-	-	-
Deepbody anchovy	11	0.1	0.1	0.3		-	-	-	-	-
Northern anchovy	2	8.6	12	17		-	+	-	-	-
Slough anchovy	10	1.0	1.2	3.4		-	-	-	-	-
Black perch	2	5.0	3.1	7.2		-	-	-	-	-
Shiner perch	6	7.7	4.3	13		-	+	-	-	-
California halibut	20	1.8	1.1	4.2		-	-	-	-	-
California killifish	2	2.6	2.4	4.4		-	-	-	-	-
Topsmelt	9	7.4	5.7	17		-	+	-	-	-
Round stingray	1	10.1	NA	10		-	-	-	-	-
Brown shrimp	2	1.7	1.2	2.6		-	-	-	-	-
Crabs	1	3.7	NA	3.7		-	-	-	-	-
Crustacea	13	11	27	100		+	+	+	+	+
Mollusks	11	1.4	1.3	4.0		-	-	-	-	-
Polychaetes	18	6.0	5.2	22		-	+	-	-	-
Plankton	13	18	29	108		+	++	+	+	+

- no exceedances

+ screening level exceeded by maximum

++ screening level exceeded by maximum and mean

Table E6. Summary data on concentrations of chlordanes in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay, with exceedances/no exceedances (+, ++, or -) of observed effect-based dietary screening levels (NOAECs; SLs) marked for avian receptor groups represented by Surf scoter (1), California least tern (2), Caspian tern (3), Double-crested cormorant (4) and Western gull (5).

CHLORDANE		Concentrations (ng/g ww)			SLs →	benthic feeding waterfowl ¹	small pelagic piscivore ²	large pelagic piscivore ³	large piscivore pelagic/demersal/benthic ⁴	generalist aquatic/non-aquatic ⁵
		N	Mean	StdDev						
Sample type	N	Mean	StdDev	Max	SLs →	513	196	369	539	1,006
Arrow goby	1	0.05	NA	<0.05		-	-	-	-	-
Goby sp.	3	0.58	0.60	1.23		-	-	-	-	-
Barred sand bass	9	1.80	1.18	3.02		-	-	-	-	-
Spotted sand bass	11	2.76	1.13	4.85		-	-	-	-	-
Deepbody anchovy	11	2.84	2.50	6.65		-	-	-	-	-
Northern anchovy	2	0.05	0.00	ND		-	-	-	-	-
Slough anchovy	10	1.25	1.07	3.58		-	-	-	-	-
Black perch	2	3.20	3.71	5.83		-	-	-	-	-
Shiner perch	6	2.65	2.92	7.76		-	-	-	-	-
California halibut	20	1.11	0.77	3.08		-	-	-	-	-
California killifish	2	0.05	0.00	ND		-	-	-	-	-
Topsmelt	9	1.25	0.98	3.43		-	-	-	-	-
Round stingray	1	10.21	NA	10.2		-	-	-	-	-
Brown shrimp	2	0.14	0.12	0.22		-	-	-	-	-
Crabs	1	0.05	NA	0.05		-	-	-	-	-
Crustacea	13	0.29	0.72	2.66		-	-	-	-	-
Mollusks	11	0.44	0.68	2.15		-	-	-	-	-
Polychaetes	18	4.40	14.3	61.6		-	-	-	-	-

- no exceedances

+ screening level exceeded by maximum

++ screening level exceeded by maximum and mean

Table E7. Summary data on concentrations of PAHs in aquatic biota from San Diego Bay, with exceedances/no exceedances (+, ++, or -) of observed effect-based dietary screening levels (NOAECs; SLs) marked for avian receptor groups represented by Surf scoter (1), California least tern (2), Caspian tern (3), Double-crested cormorant (4) and Western gull (5).

Σ HPAH	N	Concentrations (ng/g ww)			SLs	benthic feeding waterfowl ¹	small pelagic piscivore ²	large pelagic piscivore ³	large piscivore pelagic/demersal/benthic ⁴	generalist aquatic/non-aquatic ⁵
		Mean	StdDev	Max						
Sample Type	N	Mean	StdDev	Max	SLs	46	18	33	48	90
Goby sp.	3	1.8	1.3	3.3		-	-	-	-	-
Barred sand bass	9	2.7	1.4	4.9		-	-	-	-	-
Spotted sand	11	3.2	1.2	5.5		-	-	-	-	-
Slough anchovy	1	11.0	NA	11.0		-	-	-	-	-
Black perch	2	7.9	9.0	14.3		-	-	-	-	-
Shiner perch	6	6.5	2.2	9.5		-	-	-	-	-
California halibut	20	1.7	1.1	5.0		-	-	-	-	-
Round stingray	1	3.9	NA	3.9		-	-	-	-	-
Brown shrimp	2	8.0	1.7	9.2		-	-	-	-	-
Crabs	1	24.9	NA	24.9		-	++	-	-	-
Crustacea	13	44	69	226		+	++	++	+	+
Mollusks	11	55	51	173		++	++	++	++	+
Polychaetes	18	760	2,913	12,430		++	++	++	++	++
Σ LPAH										
Sample Type					SLs	946	362	680	993	1,855
Goby sp.	3	66	20	89		-	-	-	-	-
Barred sand bass	9	6	3	13		-	-	-	-	-
Spotted sand	11	11	3	16		-	-	-	-	-
Slough anchovy	1	26	NA	26		-	-	-	-	-
Black perch	2	18	6	22		-	-	-	-	-
Shiner perch	6	16	2	18		-	-	-	-	-
California halibut	20	9	6	20		-	-	-	-	-
Round stingray	1	26	NA	26		-	-	-	-	-
Brown shrimp	2	25	8	31		-	-	-	-	-
Crabs	1	50	NA	50		-	-	-	-	-
Crustacea	13	64	62	231		-	-	-	-	-
Mollusks	11	45	47	145		-	-	-	-	-
Polychaetes	18	78	83	372		-	+	-	-	-

- no exceedances

+ screening level exceeded by maximum

++ screening level exceeded by maximum and mean

APPENDIX F. EXPOSURE POINT CONCENTRATIONS (EPCs), DAILY DOSE ESTIMATES, AND HQs, ASSUMING FORAGING IS THROUGHOUT SAN DIEGO BAY

Table F1. Estimated exposure point concentrations (EPCs; ng/g ww), daily dose rates and hazard quotients (HQs) for dietary mercury (Hg) exposure by representative avian species, assuming they forage throughout San Diego Bay.

Representative species	Taxa in samples	Analyte	Region	Sample N	EPC - Ave	EPC - Max		FIR (FI/BW) (gfood/gBW-d)	AUF	Daily dose - Ave (ngHg/gBW-d)	Daily dose - Max (ngHg/kgBW-d)		HQ - NOAEL (lowest)	HQ - NOAEL (sensitive)	HQ - NOAEL (less sensitive)	HQ - LOAEL (most sensitive)	HQ - LOAEL (mid-range)
												TRVs →	(4)	(7)	(21)	(10)	(180)
CLT	gobies (Arrow), perch (black & shiner), anchovy (slough & northern), topsmelt, CA killifish	Mercury	Baywide	30	29	62		0.818	1	23.98	51	HQ - mean	6.0	3.4	1.1	2.4	0.13
												HQ - max	13	7.2	2.4	5.1	0.28
CT	sand bass (barred & spotted), perch (black & shiner), anchovy (deepbody, northern & slough), topsmelt	Mercury	Baywide	58	51	154		0.434	0.5	11.03	33	HQ - mean	2.8	1.6	0.53	1.1	0.06
												HQ - max	8.3	4.8	1.6	3.3	0.18
DCC	sand bass (barred & spotted), perch (black & shiner), anchovy (deepbody, northern & slough), topsmelt, CA halibut	Mercury	Baywide	78	52	239		0.297	1	15.36	71	HQ - mean	3.8	2.2	0.73	1.5	0.09
												HQ - max	18	10	3.4	7.1	0.40
Scoter	Crabs, misc crustacea, mollusks, polychaetes	Mercury	Baywide	37	63	429		0.312	1	21.57	148	HQ - mean	5.4	3.1	1.0	2.2	0.12
												HQ - max	37	21	7.0	15	0.82
	Sediment									1.9	14						
Gull	Anchovy (deepbody, northern & slough), topsmelt	Mercury	Baywide	30	37	109		0.412	0.9	13.79	40.39	HQ - mean	3.5	2.0	0.66	1.4	0.08
												HQ - max	10	5.6	1.9	4.0	0.22

Table F2. Estimated exposure point concentrations (EPCs; ng/g ww), daily dose rates and hazard quotients (HQs) for dietary DDT exposure by representative avian species, assuming they forage throughout San Diego Bay.

Representative species	Taxa in samples	Analyte	Region	Samples N	EPC - Ave	EPC - Max	FIR (F _i /BW) (g _{food} /g _{BW-d})	AUF	daily dose - Ave (ng _{DDT} /g _{BW-d})	daily dose - Max (ng _{DDT} /kg _{BW-d})	TRVs →	HQ - NOAEL (lowest)	HQ - NOAEL (less sensitive)	HQ - LOAEL (most sensitive)	HQ - LOAEL (mid-range)
												(9)	(227)	(27)	(1500)
CLT	gobies (Arrow & spp.), perch (black & shiner), anchovy (slough & northern), topsmelt, killifish	DDT	Baywide	35	10.3	30.9	0.818	1	8.41	25.2	HQ - mean	0.93	0.04	0.31	0.006
											HQ - max	2.81	0.11	0.94	0.017
CT	sand bass (barred & spotted), perch (black & shiner), anchovy (deepbody, northern & slough), topsmelt	DDT	Baywide	60	13.5	46.4	0.434	0.5	2.92	10.1	HQ - mean	0.32	0.01	0.11	0.002
											HQ - max	1.12	0.04	0.37	0.007
DCC	sand bass (barred & spotted), perch (black & shiner), anchovy (deepbody, northern & slough), topsmelt, halibut	DDT	Baywide	80	13.0	46.4	0.297	1	3.87	13.8	HQ - mean	0.43	0.02	0.14	0.003
											HQ - max	1.53	0.06	0.51	0.009
Scoter	Crabs, crustacea, brown shrimp, mollusks, polychaetes	DDT	Baywide	43	6.50	33.1	0.312	1	2.03	10.3	HQ - mean	0.23	0.01	0.08	0.001
											HQ - max	1.15	0.05	0.38	0.007
	sediment								0.001	0.017					
Gull	Anchovy (deepbody, northern & slough), topsmelt	DDT	Baywide	32	13.4	46.4	0.412	0.9	4.98	17.2	HQ - mean	0.55	0.02	0.18	0.003
											HQ - max	1.91	0.08	0.64	0.011

Table F3. Estimated exposure point concentrations (EPCs; ng/g ww), daily dose rates, and hazard quotients (HQs) for dietary PCB exposure by representative avian species, assuming they forage throughout San Diego Bay. PCB concentrations = Σ Bight '13 congeners, and total PCB concentrations may be greater by a factor of ~1.27.

Representative species	Taxa in samples	Analyte	Region	Samples N	EPC - Ave	EPC - Max	FIR (F/BW) (g _{food} /g _{BW-d})	AUF	daily dose - Ave (ng _{PCB} /g _{BW-d})	daily dose - Max (ng _{PCB} /kg _{BW-d})	TRVs →	HQ - NOAEL (lowest)	HQ - LOAEL (mid-range)
												(90)	(1270)
CLT	gobies (Arrow & spp.), perch (black & shiner), anchovy (slough & northern), topsmelt, killifish	PCB	Baywide	35	190	432	0.818	1	156	353	HQ - mean	1.73	0.12
											HQ - max	3.92	0.28
CT	sand bass (barred & spotted), perch (black & shiner), anchovy (deepbody, northern & slough), topsmelt	PCB	Baywide	60	226	571	0.434	0.5	49.0	124	HQ - mean	0.54	0.04
											HQ - max	1.37	0.10
DCC	sand bass (barred & spotted), perch (black & shiner), anchovy (deepbody, northern & slough), topsmelt, halibut	PCB	Baywide	80	214	571	0.297	1	63.6	170	HQ - mean	0.71	0.05
											HQ - max	1.89	0.13
Surf scoter	Crabs, brown shrimp, crustacea, mollusks, polychaetes	PCB	Baywide	43	90.3	283	0.312	1	28.3	89.0	HQ - mean	0.31	0.02
											HQ - max	0.99	0.07
	sediment								0.084	0.660			
Gull	Anchovy (deepbody, northern & slough), topsmelt	PCB	Baywide	32	223	458	0.412	0.9	82.6	170	HQ - mean	0.92	0.07
											HQ - max	1.89	0.13

Table F4. Estimated exposure point concentrations (EPCs; ng/g ww), daily dose rates, and hazard quotients (HQs) for dietary PCB-TEQ exposure by representative avian species, assuming they forage throughout San Diego Bay.

Representative species	Taxa in samples	Analyte	Region	Samples N	EPC - Ave	EPC - Max		FIR (F/BW) ($\mu\text{g}_{\text{food}}/\text{g}_{\text{BW-d}}$)	AUF	Daily dose - Ave ($\text{ng}_{\text{TEQ}}/\text{g}_{\text{BW-d}}$)	Daily dose - Max ($\text{ng}_{\text{TEQ}}/\text{kg}_{\text{BW-d}}$)		HQ - NOAEL (lowest)	HQ - LOAEL (most sensitive)	HQ - LOAEL (mid-range)
												TRVs →	(0.0011)	(0.0495)	(0.178)
CLT	gobies (Arrow & spp.), perch (black & shiner), anchovy (slough & northern), topsmelt, killifish	PCBTEQ	Baywide	35	0.01	0.113		0.818	1	0.0120	0.0920	HQ - mean	11	0.24	0.07
												HQ - max	84	1.86	0.52
CT	sand bass (barred & spotted), perch (black & shiner), anchovy (deepbody, northern & slough), topsmelt	PCBTEQ	Baywide	60	0.03	0.117		0.434	0.5	0.0061	0.0253	HQ - mean	6	0.12	0.03
												HQ - max	23	0.51	0.14
DCC	sand bass (barred & spotted), perch (black & shiner), anchovy (deepbody, northern & slough), topsmelt, halibut	PCBTEQ	Baywide	80	0.03	0.132		0.297	1	0.0095	0.0391	HQ - mean	9	0.19	0.05
												HQ - max	36	0.79	0.22
Scoter	Crabs, crustacea, brown shrimp, mollusks, polychaetes	PCBTEQ	Baywide	43	0.01	0.012		0.312	1	0.0022	0.0036	HQ - mean	2	0.04	0.01
	sediment (not calculated)											HQ - max	3	0.07	0.02
Gull	Anchovy (deepbody, northern & slough), topsmelt	PCBTEQ	Baywide	32	0.03	0.114		0.412	0.9	0.0119	0.0422	HQ - mean	11	0.24	0.07
												HQ - max	38	0.85	0.24

Table F5. Estimated exposure point concentrations (EPCs; ng/g ww), daily dose rates, and hazard quotients (HQs) for dietary PBDE exposure by representative avian species, assuming they forage throughout San Diego Bay.

Representative species	Taxa in samples	Analyte	Region	Samples N	EPC - Ave	EPC - Max	FIR (F1/BW) (g _{food} /g _{BW-d})	AUF	Daily dose - Ave (ng _{PBDE} /g _{BW-d})	Daily dose - Max (ng _{PBDE} /kg _{BW-d})	TRVs →	HQ - NOAEL (lowest)	HQ - LOAEL (most sensitive)
												9.6	96
CLT	gobies (Arrow & spp.), perch (black & shiner), anchovy (slough & northern), topsmelt, killifish	PBDE	Baywide	35	5.27	19.5	0.818	1	4.30	16.0	HQ - mean	0.45	0.045
											HQ - max	1.66	0.166
CT	sand bass (barred & spotted), perch (black & shiner), anchovy (deepbody, northern & slough), topsmelt	PBDE	Baywide	60	3.27	17.2	0.434	0.5	0.710	3.72	HQ - mean	0.074	0.007
											HQ - max	0.388	0.039
DCC	sand bass (barred & spotted), perch (black & shiner), anchovy (deepbody, northern & slough), topsmelt, halibut	PBDE	Baywide	80	2.90	17.2	0.297	1	0.862	5.10	HQ - mean	0.090	0.009
											HQ - max	0.532	0.053
Scoter	Crabs, crustacea, brown sshrimp, mollusks, polychaetes	PBDE	Baywide	43	6.33	99.5	0.312	1	2.00	31.2	HQ - mean	0.208	0.021
											HQ - max	3.255	0.326
	sediment								0.018	0.198			
Gull	Anchovy (deepbody, northern & slough), topsmelt	PBDE	Baywide	32	2.98	17.2	0.412	0.9	1.10	6.36	HQ - mean	0.115	0.012
											HQ - max	0.662	0.066

Table F6. Estimated exposure point concentrations (EPCs; ng/g ww), daily dose rates and hazard quotients (HQs) for dietary HPAH (PAH-HMW) exposure by representative avian species, assuming they forage throughout San Diego Bay.

Representative species	Taxa in samples	Analyte	Region	Samples N	EPC - Ave	EPC - Max		FIR (F/BW) (g _{food} /g _{BW-d})	AUF	Daily dose (ng _{HPAH} /g _{BW-d})	Max daily dose (ng _{HPAH} /kg _{BW-d})		HQ - NOAEL (sensitive)	HQ - LOAEL (most sensitive)
												TRVs →	(14.3)	(1430)
CLT	Black perch, shiner perch, slough anchovy, goby sp.	HPAH	Baywide	12	5.96	14.3		0.818	1	4.87	11.7	HQ - mean	0.34	0.003
												HQ - max	0.82	0.008
CT	sand bass (barred & spotted), perch (shiner & black), slough anchovy	HPAH	Baywide	29	4.33	14.3		0.434	0.5	0.939	3.11	HQ - mean	0.07	0.001
												HQ - max	0.22	0.002
DCC	sand bass (barred & spotted), perch (shiner & black), slough anchovy, halibut	HPAH	Baywide	58	2.77	14.3		0.297	1	0.823	4.26	HQ - mean	0.06	0.001
												HQ - max	0.30	0.003
Surf scoter	Crabs, crustacea, mollusks, polychaetes	HPAH	Baywide	43	346	12,430		0.312	1	111	3,899	HQ - mean	7.74	0.077
												HQ - max	273	2.73
	sediment									2.63	18.4			
Gull	Slough anchovy	HPAH	Baywide	1	11.0			0.412	0.9	4.09	NA	one sample	0.29	0.003

APPENDIX G. EXPOSURE POINT CONCENTRATIONS (EPCs), DAILY DOSE ESTIMATES, AND HQs, ASSUMING FORAGING IS PRIMARILY IN THE NORTHERN, CENTRAL AND/OR SOUTHERN BAY REGION

Table G1. Estimated exposure point concentrations (EPCs; ng/g ww), daily dose rates and hazard quotients for dietary mercury exposure by representative avian species that forage in San Diego Bay, assuming foraging is primarily in the northern, central or southern region of the bay.

Representative species	Taxa in samples	Analyte	Region	Sample N	EPC - Ave	EPC - Max	FIR (FI/BW) (g _{food} /g _{BW-d})	AUF	Daily dose - Ave (ng _{Hg} /g _{BW-d})	Daily dos- Max (ng _{Hg} /kg _{BW-d})	TRVs →	HQ - NOAEL (lowest)	HQ - NOAEL (sensitive)	HQ - NOAEL (less sensitive)	HQ - LOAEL (most sensitive)	HQ - LOAEL (mid-range)
CLT	perch (black & shiner), topsmelt	Mercury	North	8	23	36	0.818	1	18.4	29.4	HQ - mean HQ - max	5 7	2.6 4.2	0.9 1.4	1.8 2.9	0.1 0.2
CT	sand bass (barred & spotted), perch (black & shiner), topsmelt	Mercury	North	15	44	103	0.434	0.5	9.5	22.3	HQ - mean HQ - max	2.4 5.6	1.4 3.2	0.5 1.1	1.0 2.2	0.1 0.1
DCC	sand bass (barred & spotted), perch (black & shiner), halibut, topsmelt	Mercury	North	22	43	103	0.297	1	12.8	30.6	HQ - mean HQ - max	3 8	1.8 4.4	0.6 1.5	1.3 3.1	0.1 0.2
Scoter	Crabs, crustacea, mollusks, polychaetes	Mercury	North	13	46	135	0.312	1	17.4	55.7	HQ - mean HQ - max	4 14	2.5 8.0	0.8 2.7	1.7 5.6	0.1 0.3
Gull	Topsmelt	Mercury	North	NA	19	22.00	0.412	0.9	7.0	8.2	HQ - mean HQ - max	1.8 2.0	1.0 1.2	0.3 0.4	0.7 0.8	0.0 0.0
CLT	Shiner perch, slough anchovy, topsmelt	Mercury	Central	12	34	62	0.818	1	28.1	50.7	HQ - mean HQ - max	7 13	4.0 7.2	1.3 2.4	2.8 5.1	0.2 0.3
CT	sand bass (barred & spotted), anchovy (deepbody & slough), shiner perch, topsmelt	Mercury	Central	25	59	124	0.434	0.5	12.8	27.0	HQ - mean	3.2	1.8	0.6	1.3	0.1

Representative species	Taxa in samples	Analyte	Region	Sample N	EPC - Ave	EPC - Max		FIR (F/BW) (g _{food} /g _{BW-d})	AUF	Daily dose - Ave (ng _{Hg} /g _{BW-d})	Daily dos- Max (ng _{Hg} /kg _{BW-d})		HQ - NOAEL (lowest)	HQ - NOAEL (sensitive)	HQ - NOAEL (less sensitive)	HQ - LOAEL (most sensitive)	HQ - LOAEL (mid-range)
												HQ - max	6.7	3.9	1.3	2.7	0.1
DCC	sand bass (barred & spotted), anchovy (deepbody & slough), shiner perch, topsmelt, halibut	Mercury	Central	32	62	239		0.297	1	18.6	71.1	HQ - mean	4.6	2.7	0.9	1.9	0.1
												HQ - max	17.8	10.2	3.4	7.1	0.4
Scoter	Crustacea, mollusks, polychaetes	Mercury	Central	14	93	429		0.312	1	30.8	138.6	HQ - mean	7.7	4.4	1.5	3.1	0.2
												HQ - max	34.6	19.8	6.6	13.9	0.8
	sediment									1.8	4.5						
Gull	anchovy (deepbody & slough), topsmelt	Mercury	Central	16	48	109.00		0.412	0.9	17.8	40.4	HQ - mean	4.4	2.5	0.8	1.8	0.1
												HQ - max	10.1	5.8	1.9	4.0	0.2
CLT	Arrow goby, killifish, anchovy (northern & slough), topsmelt, killifish	Mercury	South	10	29	46		0.818	1	23.5	37.6	HQ - mean	6	3.4	1.1	2.3	0.1
												HQ - max	9	5.4	1.8	3.8	0.2
CT	sand bass (barred & spotted), anchovy (deepbody, northern & slough), shiner perch, topsmelt	Mercury	South	18	45	154		0.434	0.5	9.8	33.3	HQ - mean	2.4	1.4	0.5	1.0	0.1
												HQ - max	8.3	4.8	1.6	3.3	0.2
DCC	sand bass (barred & spotted), anchovy (deepbody, slough, northern), shiner perch, topsmelt, halibut	Mercury	South	24	45	154		0.297	1	13.5	45.7	HQ - mean	3	1.9	0.6	1.3	0.1
												HQ - max	11	6.5	2.2	4.6	0.3
Scoter	Crustacea, mollusks, polychaetes	Mercury	South	10	44	165		0.312	1	21.5	55.8	HQ - mean	5	3.1	1.0	2.2	0.1
												HQ - max	14	8.0	2.7	5.6	0.3

Representative species	Taxa in samples	Analyte	Region	Sample N	EPC - Ave	EPC - Max		FIR (F/BW) (g _{food} /g _{BW-d})	AUF	Daily dose - Ave (ng _{Hg} /g _{BW-d})	Daily dos- Max (ng _{Hg} /kg _{BW-d})		HQ - NOAEL (lowest)	HQ - NOAEL (sensitive)	HQ - NOAEL (less sensitive)	HQ - LOAEL (most sensitive)	HQ - LOAEL (mid-range)
Scoter	sediment									7.9	4.4						
Gull	anchovy (deepbody, northern & slough), topsmelt	Mercury	South	11	27	42.00		0.412	0.9	9.8	15.6	HQ - mean	2.46	1.4	0.5	1.0	0.1
												HQ - max	3.89	2.2	0.7	1.6	0.1

Table G2. Estimated exposure point concentrations (EPCs; ng/g ww), daily dose rates and hazard quotients (HQs) for dietary DDT exposure by representative avian species that forage in San Diego Bay, assuming foraging is primarily in the northern, central or southern region of the bay.

Representative species	Taxa in samples	Analyte	Region	Sample N	EPC - Ave	EPC - Max	FIR (FI/BW) (g _{food} /g _{BW-d})	AUF	ave. daily dose (ng _{DDT} /g _{BW-d})	Max daily dose (ng _{DDT} /kg _{BW-d})	TRVs →	HQ - NOAEL (lowest)	HQ - NOAEL (less sensitive)	HQ - LOAEL (most sensitive)	HQ - LOAEL (mid-range)
											(9)	(227)	(27)	(1500)	
CLT	Black perch, goby sp., shiner perch, topsmelt	DDT	North	9	12.3	22.1	0.818	1	10.1	18.0	HQ mean	1.12	0.04	0.37	0.01
											HQ max	2.00	0.08	0.67	0.01
CT	sand bass (barred & spotted), perch (black & shiner), topsmelt	DDT	North	15	14.9	40.3	0.434	0.5	3.2	8.7	HQ mean	0.36	0.01	0.12	0.003
											HQ max	0.97	0.04	0.32	0.01
DCC	sand bass (barred & spotted), perch (black & shiner), halibut topsmelt	DDT	North	22	14.6	40.3	0.297	1	4.3	12.0	HQ mean	0.48	0.02	0.16	0.002
											HQ max	1.33	0.05	0.44	0.01
Scoter	Crabs, brown shrimp, misc. crustacea, mollusks, polychaetes	DDT	North	16	9.5	33.1	0.312	1	3.0	10.3	HQ mean	0.33	0.01	0.11	0.002
											HQ max	1.15	0.05	0.38	0.01
	sediment								0.001	0.003					
Gull	Topsmelt	DDT	North	3	8.9	11.7	0.412	0.9	3.3	4.3	HQ mean	0.37	0.01	0.12	0.003
											HQ max	0.48	0.12	0.16	0.003
CLT	Goby sp., shiner perch, slough anchovy, topsmelt	DDT	Central	14	10.3	16.3	0.818	1	8.4	13.3	HQ mean	0.93	0.04	0.31	0.01
											HQ max	1.48	0.06	0.49	0.01
CT	sand bass (barred & spotted), anchovy (deepbody & slough), topsmelt, shiner perch	DDT	Central	26	14.7	46.4	0.434	0.5	3.2	10.1	HQ mean	0.36	0.01	0.12	0.002
											HQ max	1.12	0.04	0.37	0.01
DCC	sand bass (barred & spotted), anchovy (deepbody & slough), halibut, topsmelt, shiner perch	DDT	Central	33	13.6	46.4	0.297	1	4.0	13.8	HQ mean	0.45	0.02	0.15	0.003
											HQ max	1.53	0.06	0.51	0.01

Representative species	Taxa in samples	Analyte	Region	Sample N	EPC - Ave	EPC - Max	FIR (FI/BW) (g _{food} /g _{BW-d})	AUF	ave. daily dose (ng _{DDT} /g _{BW-d})	Max daily dose (ng _{DDT} /kg _{BW-d})		HQ - NOAEL (lowest)	HQ - NOAEL (less sensitive)	HQ - LOAEL (most sensitive)	HQ - LOAEL (mid-range)
Scoter	misc. crustacea, mollusks, polychaetes	DDT	Central	14	0.6	11.5	0.312	1	0.2	3.6	HQ mean	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.000
	sediment								0.000	0.003	HQ max	0.40	0.02	0.13	0.002
Gull	Anchovy (deepbody & slough), topsmelt	DDT	Central	17	16.8	46.4	0.412	0.9	6.2	17.2	HQ mean	0.69	0.03	0.23	0.004
											HQ max	1.91	0.08	0.64	0.01
CLT	Arrow goby, goby sp., CA killifish, anchovy (northern & slough), shiner perch, topsmelt	DDT	South	12	8.8	30.9	0.818	1	7.2	25.2	HQ mean	0.80	0.03	0.27	0.01
											HQ max	2.81	0.11	0.94	0.02
CT	sand bass (barred & spotted), anchovy (deepbody, northern, slough), shiner perch, topsmelt	DDT	South	19	10.6	30.9	0.434	0.5	2.3	6.7	HQ mean	0.25	0.01	0.08	0.002
											HQ max	0.74	0.03	0.25	0.004
DCC	sand bass (barred & spotted), anchovy (deepbody, northern, slough), halibut, shiner perch, topsmelt	DDT	South	25	10.9	30.9	0.297	1	3.2	9.2	HQ mean	0.36	0.01	0.12	0.002
											HQ max	1.02	0.04	0.34	0.01
Scoter	crustacea, mollusks, polychaetes	DDT	South	14	5.0	21.5	0.312	1	1.6	6.7	HQ mean	0.17	0.01	0.06	0.002
	sediment								0.001	0.013	HQ max	0.75	0.03	0.25	0.01
Gull	anchovy (deepbody, northern, slough), topsmelt	DDT	South	12	9.8	30.9	0.412	0.9	3.6	11.4	HQ mean	0.40	0.02	0.13	0.00
											HQ max	1.27	0.05	0.42	0.01

Table G3. Estimated exposure point concentrations (EPCs; ng/g ww), daily dose rates and hazard quotients for dietary PCB exposure by representative avian species that forage in San Diego Bay, assuming foraging is primarily in the northern, central or southern region of the bay. PCB concentrations in food web samples = ΣBight '13 congeners, and total PCB concentrations may be greater by a factor of ~1.27.

Representative species	Taxa in samples		Region	Sample N	EPC - Ave	EPC - Max		FIR (F/BW) (gf _{food} /g _{BW-d})	AUF	ave. daily dose (ng _{PCB} /g _{BW-d})	Max daily dose (ng _{PCB} /kg _{BW-d})		HQ - NOAEL (lowest)	HQ - LOAEL (mid-range)
												TRVs →	(90)	(1270)
CLT	Black perch, goby sp., shiner perch, topsmelt	PCBs	North	9	192	432		0.818	1	157	353	HQ mean	1.75	0.12
												HQ max	3.92	0.28
CT	sand bass (barred & spotted), perch (black & shiner), topsmelt	PCBs	North	15	217	432		0.434	0.5	47	94	HQ mean	0.52	0.04
												HQ max	1.04	0.07
DCC	sand bass (barred & spotted), perch (black & shiner), halibut topsmelt	PCBs	North	22	200	432		0.297	1	59	128	HQ mean	0.66	0.05
												HQ max	1.43	0.10
Scoter	Crabs, brown shrimp, misc. crustacea, mollusks, polychaetes	PCBs	North	16	91	169		0.312	1	29	53	HQ mean	0.32	0.02
												HQ max	0.59	0.04
	sediment									0.15	0.66			
Gull	Topsmelt	PCBs	North	3	146	210		0.412	0.9	54	78	HQ mean	0.60	0.04
												HQ max	0.86	0.06
CLT	Goby sp., shiner perch, slough anchovy, topsmelt	PCBs	Central	14	244	327		0.818	1	200	267	HQ mean	2.22	0.16
												HQ max	2.97	0.21
CT	sand bass (barred & spotted), anchovy (deepbody & slough), topsmelt, shiner perch	PCBs	Central	26	282	571		0.434	0.5	61	124	HQ mean	0.68	0.05
												HQ max	1.37	0.10
DCC	sand bass (barred & spotted), anchovy (deepbody & slough), halibut, topsmelt, shiner perch	PCBs	Central	33	268	571		0.297	1	80	170	HQ mean	0.89	0.06
												HQ max	1.89	0.13
Scoter	crustacea, mollusks, polychaetes	PCBs	Central	14	13	283		0.312	1	4	89	HQ mean	0.05	0.00
												HQ max	0.98	0.07
	Sediment									0.05	0.18			

Representative species	Taxa in samples		Region	Sample N	EPC - Ave	EPC - Max		FIR (F/BW) (g _{food} /g _{BW-d})	AUF	ave. daily dose (ng _{Pcb} /g _{BW-d})	Max daily dose (ng _{Pcb} /kg _{BW-d})		HQ - NOAEL (lowest)	HQ - LOAEL (mid-range)
Gull	Anchovy (deepbody & slough), topsmelt	PCBs	Central	17	283	458		0.412	0.9	105	170	HQ mean	1.17	0.08
												HQ max	1.89	0.13
CLT	Arrow goby, goby sp., CA killifish, anchovy (northern & slough), shiner perch, topsmelt	PCBs	South	12	126	231		0.818	1	103	189	HQ mean	1.14	0.08
												HQ max	2.10	0.15
CT	sand bass (barred & spotted), anchovy (deepbody, northern, slough), shiner perch, topsmelt	PCBs	South	19	157	295		0.434	0.5	34	64	HQ mean	0.38	0.03
												HQ max	0.71	0.05
DCC	sand bass (barred & spotted), anchovy (deepbody, northern, slough), halibut, shiner perch, topsmelt	PCBs	South	25	154	295		0.297	1	46	88	HQ mean	0.51	0.04
												HQ max	0.97	0.07
Scoter	crustacea, mollusks, polychaetes	PCBs	South	14	54	146		0.312	1	17	46	HQ mean	0.19	0.01
												HQ max	0.51	0.04
	sediment									0.019	0.098			
Gull	anchovy (deepbody, northern, slough), topsmelt	PCBs	South	12	157	231		0.412	0.9	58	85	HQ mean	0.65	0.05
												HQ max	0.95	0.07

Table G4. Estimated exposure point concentrations (EPCs; ng/g ww), daily dose rates and hazard quotients for dietary PCB-TEQ exposure by representative avian species that forage in San Diego Bay, assuming foraging is primarily in the northern, central or southern region of the bay.

Representative species	Taxa in samples		Region	Sample N	EPC - Ave	EPC - Max		FIR (FI/BW) (g_{food}/g_{BW-d})	AUF	ave. daily dose (ng_{TEQ}/g_{BW-d})	Max daily dose (ng_{TEQ}/kg_{BW-d})		HQ - NOAEL (lowest)	HQ - LOAEL (most sensitive)	HQ - LOAEL (mid-range)
												TRVs →	(0.0011)	(0.0495)	(0.178)
CLT	Black perch, goby sp., shiner perch, topsmelt	PCBTEQ	North	9	0.0071	0.0278		0.818	1	0.006	0.023	HQ mean	5.3	0.12	0.03
												HQ max	20.6	0.46	0.13
CT	sand bass (barred & spotted), perch (black & shiner), topsmelt	PCBTEQ	North	15	0.0110	0.0278		0.434	0.5	0.002	0.006	HQ mean	2.2	0.05	0.01
												HQ max	5.5	0.12	0.03
DCC	sand bass (barred & spotted), perch (black & shiner), halibut, topsmelt	PCBTEQ	North	22	0.0095	0.0690		0.297	1	0.0028	0.0205	HQ mean	2.6	0.06	0.02
												HQ max	18.7	0.41	0.12
Scoter	Crabs, brown shrimp, misc. crustacea, mollusks, polychaetes	PCBTEQ	North	16	0.0066	0.0085		0.312	1	0.0020	0.0027	HQ mean	1.9	0.04	0.01
												HQ max	2.4	0.05	0.01
Gull	Topsmelt	PCBTEQ	North	3	0.0072	0.0081		0.412	0.9	0.0027	0.0030	HQ mean	2.4	0.05	0.02
												HQ max	2.7	0.06	0.02
CLT	Goby sp., shiner perch, slough anchovy, topsmelt	PCBTEQ	Central	14	0.0076	0.0204		0.818	1	0.0062	0.0167	HQ mean	5.6	0.13	0.03
												HQ max	15.2	0.34	0.09
CT	sand bass (barred & spotted), anchovy (deepbody & slough), topsmelt, shiner perch	PCBTEQ	Central	26	0.0199	0.0902		0.434	0.5	0.0043	0.0195	HQ mean	3.9	0.09	0.02
												HQ max	17.8	0.39	0.11
DCC	sand bass (barred & spotted), anchovy (deepbody & slough), CA halibut, topsmelt, shiner perch	PCBTEQ	Central	33	0.0173	0.0902		0.297	1	0.0052	0.0268	HQ mean	4.7	0.10	0.03

Representative species	Taxa in samples		Region	Sample N	EPC - Ave	EPC - Max		FIR (F/BW) (g _{food} /g _{BW-d})	AUF	ave. daily dose (ng _{TEQ} /g _{BW-d})	Max daily dose (ng _{TEQ} /kg _{BW-d})		HQ - NOAEL (lowest)	HQ - LOAEL (most sensitive)	HQ - LOAEL (mid-range)
												HQ max	24.4	0.54	0.15
Scoter	crustacea, mollusks, polychaetes	PCBTEQ	Central	14	0.0064	0.0068		0.312	1	0.0020	0.0021	HQ mean	1.8	0.04	0.01
												HQ max	1.9	0.04	0.01
Gull	Anchovy (deepbody & slough), topsmelt	PCBTEQ	Central	17	0.0240	0.0902		0.412	0.9	0.0089	0.0334	HQ mean	8.1	0.18	0.05
												HQ max	30.4	0.67	0.19
CLT	Arrow goby, goby sp., CA killifish, anchovy (northern & slough), shiner perch, topsmelt	PCBTEQ	South	12	0.0068	0.0083		0.818	1	0.0055	0.0068	HQ mean	5.0	0.11	0.03
												HQ max	6.2	0.14	0.04
CT	sand bass (barred & spotted), anchovy (deepbody, northern, slough), shiner perch, topsmelt	PCBTEQ	South	19	0.0100	0.0455		0.434	0.5	0.0022	0.0099	HQ mean	2.0	0.04	0.01
												HQ max	9.0	0.20	0.06
DCC	sand bass (barred & spotted), anchovy (deepbody, northern, slough), CA halibut, shiner perch, topsmelt	PCBTEQ	South	25	0.0091	0.0455		0.297	1	0.0027	0.0135	HQ mean	2.5	0.05	0.02
												HQ max	12.3	0.27	0.08
Scoter	misc. crustacea, mollusks, polychaetes	PCBTEQ	South	14	0.0064	0.0064		0.312	1	0.0020	0.0020	HQ mean	1.8	0.04	0.01
												HQ max	1.8	0.04	0.01
Gull	anchovy (deepbody, northern, slough), topsmelt	PCBTEQ	South	12	0.0075	0.0455		0.412	0.9	0.0028	0.0169	HQ mean	2.5	0.06	0.02
												HQ max	15.3	0.34	0.09

Table G5. Estimated exposure point concentrations (EPCs; ng/g ww), daily dose rates and hazard quotients for dietary PBDE exposure by representative avian species that forage in San Diego Bay, assuming foraging is primarily in the northern, central or southern region of the bay.

Representative species	Taxa in samples		Region	Sample N	EPC - Ave	EPC - Max		FIR (F/BW) ($\frac{\text{ng}_{\text{food}}}{\text{g}_{\text{BW-d}}}$)	AUF	ave. daily dose ($\frac{\text{ng}_{\text{PBDE}}}{\text{g}_{\text{BW-d}}}$)	Max daily dose ($\frac{\text{ng}_{\text{PBDE}}}{\text{kg}_{\text{BW-d}}}$)		HQ - NOAEL (lowest)	HQ - LOAEL (most sensitive)
												TRVs →	(9.6)	(96)
CLT	Black perch, goby sp., shiner perch, topsmelt	PBDE	North	9	6.14	12.51		0.818	1	5.02	10.22	HQ mean	0.52	0.05
												HQ max	1.06	0.11
CT	sand bass (barred & spotted), perch (black & shiner), topsmelt	PBDE	North	15	4.84	12.51		0.434	0.5	1.05	2.71	HQ mean	0.11	0.01
												HQ max	0.28	0.03
DCC	sand bass (barred & spotted), perch (black & shiner), CA halibut topsmelt	PBDE	North	22	3.76	12.51		0.297	1	1.12	3.72	HQ mean	0.12	0.01
												HQ max	0.39	0.04
Scoter	Crabs, brown shrimp, crustacea, mollusks, polychaetes	PBDE	North	16	2.68	6.17		0.312	1	0.85	2.06	HQ mean	0.09	0.01
												HQ max	0.21	0.02
	sediment									0.01	0.13			
Gull	Topsmelt	PBDE	North	3	5.53	7.63		0.412	0.9	2.05	2.83	HQ mean	0.21	0.02
												HQ max	0.29	0.03
CLT	Goby sp., shiner perch, slough anchovy, topsmelt	PBDE	Central	14	3.51	15.20		0.818	1	2.87	12.43	HQ mean	0.30	0.03
												HQ max	1.29	0.13
CT	sand bass (barred & spotted), anchovy (deepbody & slough), topsmelt, shiner perch	PBDE	Central	26	2.37	15.20		0.434	0.5	0.51	3.30	HQ mean	0.05	0.01
												HQ max	0.34	0.03
DCC	sand bass (barred & spotted), anchovy (deepbody & slough), CA halibut, topsmelt, shiner perch	PBDE	Central	33	2.26	15.20		0.297	1	0.67	4.52	HQ mean	0.07	0.01
												HQ max	0.47	0.05
Scoter	crustacea, mollusks, polychaetes	PBDE	Central	14	0.46	10.51		0.312	1	0.17	3.47	HQ mean	0.02	0.00
												HQ max	0.36	0.04
	sediment									0.02	0.19			

Representative species	Taxa in samples		Region	Sample N	EPC - Ave	EPC - Max		FIR (F/BW) (g _{food} /g _{BW-d})	AUF	ave. daily dose (ng _{PBDE} /g _{BW-d})	Max daily dose (ng _{PBDE} /kg _{BW-d})		HQ - NOAEL (lowest)	HQ - LOAEL (most sensitive)
WEGU	Anchovy (deepbody & slough), topsmelt	PBDE	Central	17	1.60	15.20		0.412	0.9	0.59	5.63	HQ mean	0.06	0.01
												HQ max	0.59	0.06
CLT	Arrow goby, goby sp., CA killifish, anchovy (northern & slough), shiner perch, topsmelt	PBDE	South	12	6.66	19.53		0.818	1	5.44	15.97	HQ mean	0.57	0.06
												HQ max	1.66	0.17
CT	sand bass (barred & spotted), anchovy (deepbody, northern, slough), shiner perch, topsmelt	PBDE	South	19	3.27	17.16		0.434	0.5	0.71	3.72	HQ mean	0.07	0.01
												HQ max	0.39	0.04
DCC	sand bass (barred & spotted), anchovy (deepbody, northern, slough), CA halibut, shiner perch, topsmelt	PBDE	South	25	2.99	17.16		0.297	1	0.89	5.10	HQ mean	0.09	0.01
												HQ max	0.53	0.05
Scoter	crustacea, mollusks, polychaetes	PBDE	South	14	12.73	99.45		0.312	1	3.99	31.25	HQ mean	0.42	0.04
												HQ max	3.26	0.33
	sediment									0.02	0.20			
Gull	anchovy (deepbody, northern, slough), topsmelt	PBDE	South	12	4.30	17.16		0.412	0.9	1.59	6.36	HQ mean	0.17	0.02
												HQ max	0.66	0.07

Table G6. Estimated exposure point concentrations (EPCs; ng/g ww), daily dose rates and hazard quotients for dietary HPAH (or PAH-HMW) exposure by representative avian species that forage in San Diego Bay, assuming foraging is primarily in northern, central or southern region of the bay.

Representative species	Taxa in samples		Region	Sample N	EPC - Ave	EPC - Max		FIR (F/BW) (g _{food} /g _{BW-d})	AUF	ave. daily dose (ng _{HPAH} /g _{BW-d})	Max daily dose (ng _{HPAH} /kg _{BW-d})		HQ - NOAEL (sensitive)	HQ - LOAEL (most sensitive)
												TRVs →	14.3	(1430)
CLT	perch (black & shiner), goby sp.	HPAH	North	6	7	14		0.818	1	5.5	11.7	HQ mean	0.39	0.00
												HQ max	0.82	0.01
CT	sand bass (barred & spotted), perch (black & shiner)	HPAH	North	12	5	14		0.434	0.5	1.1	3.1	HQ mean	0.07	0.00
												HQ max	0.22	0.00
DCC	sand bass (barred & spotted), perch (black & shiner), halibut	HPAH	North	19	4	14		0.297	1	1.1	4.3	HQ mean	0.07	0.00
												HQ max	0.30	0.00
Scoter	Crabs, crustacea, mollusks, polychaetes	HPAH	North	16	864	12,430		0.312	1	275	3,899	HQ mean	19.2	0.19
												HQ max	273	2.73
	sediment	HPAH	Central							4.9	18.4			
CLT	Goby sp., shiner perch	HPAH	Central	3	5	9		0.818	1	4.1	7.7	HQ mean	0.29	0.00
												HQ max	0.54	0.01
CT	sand bass (barred & spotted)	HPAH	Central	9	4	9		0.434	0.5	0.8	2.1	HQ mean	0.06	0.00
												HQ max	0.14	0.00
DCC	sand bass (barred & spotted), shiner perch, halibut	HPAH	Central	16.00	3	9		0.297	1	0.9	2.8	HQ mean	0.06	0.00
												HQ max	0.20	0.00
Scoter	Crustacea, mollusks, polychaetes	HPAH	Central	14	6	130		0.312	1	3.5	48.6	HQ mean	0.25	0.00
												HQ max	3.40	0.03

Representative species	Taxa in samples		Region	Sample N	EPC - Ave	EPC - Max		FIR (F/I/BW) (g _{food} /g _{BW-d})	AUF	ave. daily dose (ng _{HPAH} /g _{BW-d})	Max daily dose (ng _{HPAH} /kg _{BW-d})		HQ - NOAEL (sensitive)	HQ - LOAEL (most sensitive)
	Sediment									1.7	8.1			
CLT	Goby sp., shine perch, slough anchovy	HPAH	South	3	5	11		0.818	1	4.3	9.0	HQ mean	0.299	0.003
												HQ max	0.631	0.006
CT	sand bass (barred & spotted), shiner perch, slough anchovy	HPAH	South	8	4	11		0.434	0.5	0.9	2.4	HQ mean	0.062	0.001
												HQ max	0.167	0.002
DCC	sand bass (barred & spotted), CA halibut, shiner perch, slough anchovy	HPAH	South	14	3	11		0.297	1	0.9	3.3	HQ mean	0.066	0.001
												HQ max	0.230	0.002
Scoter	Crustacea, mollusks, polychaetes	HPAH	South	14	29	131		0.312	1	9.9	44.0	HQ mean	0.693	0.007
												HQ max	3.077	0.031
	sediment									0.9	3.1			
Gull	Slough anchovy	HPAH	South	1	11	11		0.412	0.9	4.1	4.1	HQ single	0.286	0.003

APPENDIX H. SPORT FISH COMPOSITE INFORMATION.

Table H1. Station identifiers and fish measurements for sport fish composites.

StationID	Sample ID	Common Name	Sample Date	Item	Standard Length	Standard Length Units	Weight	Weight Units	Fish Fraction	Multi Organism Composite
SU-1	SDBS-10-SSB	Spotted sand bass	14-Oct-14	1	253	mm	420.7	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
SU-1	SDBS-10-SSB	Spotted sand bass	14-Oct-14	2	254	mm	383.3	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
SU-1	SDBS-10-SSB	Spotted sand bass	14-Oct-14	3	225	mm	321.6	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
SU-1	SDBS-10-SSB	Spotted sand bass	14-Oct-14	4	255	mm	363.2	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
SU-1	SDBS-10-SSB	Spotted sand bass	14-Oct-14	5	221	mm	254.5	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
Shelter Island Pier	SDBS-1-CH	California halibut	06-Jun-15	1	352	mm	747.6	g	Fish fillet without skin	FALSE
Embarcadero South Pier	SDBS-1-PCM	Pacific chub mackerel	06-Jun-15	1	232	mm	170	g	Whole fish without guts, head or tail, skin on	TRUE
Embarcadero South Pier	SDBS-1-PCM	Pacific chub mackerel	06-Jun-15	2	215	mm	154.9	g	Whole fish without guts, head or tail, skin on	TRUE
Embarcadero South Pier	SDBS-1-PCM	Pacific chub mackerel	06-Jun-15	3	214	mm	133.8	g	Whole fish without guts, head or tail, skin on	TRUE
Embarcadero South Pier	SDBS-1-PCM	Pacific chub mackerel	06-Jun-15	4	211	mm	127.1	g	Whole fish without guts, head or tail, skin on	TRUE
Embarcadero South Pier	SDBS-1-PCM	Pacific chub mackerel	06-Jun-15	5	205	mm	111.1	g	Whole fish without guts, head or tail, skin on	TRUE
Embarcadero South Pier	SDBS-1-RSR	Round stingray	06-Jun-15	1	190	mm	332	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
Embarcadero South Pier	SDBS-1-RSR	Round stingray	06-Jun-15	2	120	mm	286.5	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
Embarcadero South Pier	SDBS-1-RSR	Round stingray	06-Jun-15	3	160	mm	215.1	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
Embarcadero South Pier	SDBS-1-RSR	Round stingray	06-Jun-15	4	151	mm	184.7	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
NB-10	SDBS-1-SSB	Spotted sand bass	25-Sep-14	3	262	mm	434.6	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE

NB-12	SDBS-1-SSB	Spotted sand bass	25-Sep-14	4	263	mm	431.1	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
NB-14	SDBS-1-SSB	Spotted sand bass	25-Sep-14	5	263	mm	395.5	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
NB-5	SDBS-1-SSB	Spotted sand bass	25-Sep-14	1	241	mm	302.8	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
NB-7	SDBS-1-SSB	Spotted sand bass	25-Sep-14	2	195	mm	183.3	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
Pepper Park Pier	SDBS-2-TS	Topsmelt	06-Jun-15	4	136	mm	24.4	g	Whole fish without guts, head or tail, skin on	TRUE
Pepper Park Pier	SDBS-2-TS	Topsmelt	06-Jun-15	1	138	mm	31.3	g	Whole fish without guts, head or tail, skin on	TRUE
Pepper Park Pier	SDBS-2-TS	Topsmelt	06-Jun-15	2	129	mm	26.1	g	Whole fish without guts, head or tail, skin on	TRUE
Pepper Park Pier	SDBS-2-TS	Topsmelt	06-Jun-15	3	136	mm	26.8	g	Whole fish without guts, head or tail, skin on	TRUE
Shelter Island Pier	SDBS-2-CH	California halibut	06-Jun-15	1	399	mm	898.5	g	Fish fillet without skin	FALSE
Shelter Island Pier	SDBS-2-PCM	Pacific chub mackerel	06-Jun-15	1	226	mm	133.5	g	Whole fish without guts, head or tail, skin on	TRUE
Shelter Island Pier	SDBS-2-PCM	Pacific chub mackerel	06-Jun-15	2	201	mm	96.1	g	Whole fish without guts, head or tail, skin on	TRUE
Shelter Island Pier	SDBS-2-PCM	Pacific chub mackerel	06-Jun-15	3	202	mm	90.9	g	Whole fish without guts, head or tail, skin on	TRUE
Shelter Island Pier	SDBS-2-PCM	Pacific chub mackerel	06-Jun-15	4	331	mm	454.4	g	Whole fish without guts, head or tail, skin on	TRUE
Shelter Island Pier	SDBS-2-PCM	Pacific chub mackerel	06-Jun-15	5	196	mm	90.4	g	Whole fish without guts, head or tail, skin on	TRUE
Shelter Island Pier	SDBS-2-RSR	Round stingray	06-Jun-15	1	209	mm	524	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
Shelter Island Pier	SDBS-2-RSR	Round stingray	06-Jun-15	2	189	mm	377.4	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
Shelter Island Pier	SDBS-2-RSR	Round stingray	06-Jun-15	3	173	mm	346.8	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
Shelter Island Pier	SDBS-2-RSR	Round stingray	06-Jun-15	4	172	mm	242.3	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE

Shelter Island Pier	SDBS-2-RSR	Round stingray	06-Jun-15	5	149	mm	223.7	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
Coronado Tidelands Park Pier	SDBS-2-SSB	Spotted sand bass	06-Jun-15	1	258	mm	412.4	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
Coronado Tidelands Park Pier	SDBS-2-SSB	Spotted sand bass	06-Jun-15	2	256	mm	445.5	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
Coronado Tidelands Park Pier	SDBS-2-SSB	Spotted sand bass	06-Jun-15	3	259	mm	391.3	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
Coronado Tidelands Park Pier	SDBS-2-SSB	Spotted sand bass	06-Jun-15	4	235	mm	402.2	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
CB-1	SDBS-3-CH	California halibut	14-Oct-14	1	396	mm	1024.9	g	Fish fillet without skin	FALSE
SB-5	SDBS-3-PCM	Pacific chub mackerel	06-Jun-15	1	219	mm	132.5	g	Whole fish without guts, head or tail, skin on	TRUE
SB-6	SDBS-3-PCM	Pacific chub mackerel	06-Jun-15	2	225	mm	159.9	g	Whole fish without guts, head or tail, skin on	TRUE
SB-7	SDBS-3-PCM	Pacific chub mackerel	06-Jun-15	3	220	mm	116.9	g	Whole fish without guts, head or tail, skin on	TRUE
SB-8	SDBS-3-PCM	Pacific chub mackerel	06-Jun-15	4	215	mm	129.6	g	Whole fish without guts, head or tail, skin on	TRUE
Embarcadero South Pier	SDBS-3-SSB	Spotted sand bass	06-Jun-15	1	296	mm	581.5	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
Embarcadero South Pier	SDBS-3-SSB	Spotted sand bass	06-Jun-15	2	271	mm	461.9	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
Embarcadero South Pier	SDBS-3-SSB	Spotted sand bass	06-Jun-15	3	249	mm	351.7	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
Embarcadero South Pier	SDBS-3-SSB	Spotted sand bass	06-Jun-15	4	256	mm	396.5	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
Embarcadero South Pier	SDBS-3-SSB	Spotted sand bass	06-Jun-15	5	243	mm	367.5	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
CB-2	SDBS-4-CH	California halibut	10-Dec-14	1	386	mm	807.9	g	Fish fillet without skin	FALSE
Shelter Island Pier	SDBS-4-SSB	Spotted sand bass	06-Jun-15	1	405	mm	1218.7	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
NB-19	SDBS-4-SSB	Spotted sand bass	06-Jun-15	3	279	mm	536.2	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE

NB-20	SDBS-4-SSB	Spotted sand bass	06-Jun-15	2	269	mm	546.6	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
CB-24	SDBS-5-CH	California halibut	06-Jun-15	1	315	mm	672.6	g	Fish fillet without skin	FALSE
CB-19	SDBS-5-SSB	Spotted sand bass	10-Dec-14	3	273	mm	428.2	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
CB-20	SDBS-5-SSB	Spotted sand bass	10-Dec-14	4	277	mm	441.3	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
CB-21	SDBS-5-SSB	Spotted sand bass	10-Dec-14	5	263	mm	406.6	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
CB-8	SDBS-5-SSB	Spotted sand bass	10-Dec-14	1	253	mm	404.7	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
CB-9	SDBS-5-SSB	Spotted sand bass	10-Dec-14	2	240	mm	349.1	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
SB-1	SDBS-6-CH	California halibut	10-Dec-14	1	315	mm	503.2	g	Fish fillet without skin	FALSE
CB-10	SDBS-6-SSB	Spotted sand bass	10-Dec-14	2	234	mm	308.1	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
CB-12	SDBS-6-SSB	Spotted sand bass	10-Dec-14	3	226	mm	254.3	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
CB-14	SDBS-6-SSB	Spotted sand bass	10-Dec-14	4	215	mm	253.8	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
CB-15	SDBS-6-SSB	Spotted sand bass	10-Dec-14	5	219	mm	234	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
CB-7	SDBS-6-SSB	Spotted sand bass	10-Dec-14	1	245	mm	367.9	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
CB-5	SDBS-7-CH	California halibut	04-Jul-15	1	711	mm	226	g	Fish fillet without skin	FALSE
CB-30	SDBS-7-SSB	Spotted sand bass	06-Jun-15	1	246	mm	279.5	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
CB-33	SDBS-7-SSB	Spotted sand bass	06-Jun-15	2	247	mm	405.4	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
CB-34	SDBS-7-SSB	Spotted sand bass	06-Jun-15	3	246	mm	324.5	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
CB-35	SDBS-7-SSB	Spotted sand bass	06-Jun-15	4	245	mm	315.9	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
CB-25	SDBS-8-CH	California halibut	05-Jul-15	1	423	mm	1079.2	g	Fish fillet without skin	FALSE
CB-22	SDBS-8-SSB	Spotted sand bass	06-Jun-15	3	238	mm	334.5	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
CB-28	SDBS-8-SSB	Spotted sand bass	06-Jun-15	1	263	mm	435.4	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
CB-29	SDBS-8-SSB	Spotted sand bass	06-Jun-15	2	245	mm	341.1	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE

CB-32	SDBS-8-SSB	Spotted sand bass	06-Jun-15	4	245	mm	388.8	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
Pepper Park Pier	SDBS-9-SSB	Spotted sand bass	06-Jun-15	1	267	mm	422.4	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
Pepper Park Pier	SDBS-9-SSB	Spotted sand bass	06-Jun-15	2	261	mm	498.7	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
Pepper Park Pier	SDBS-9-SSB	Spotted sand bass	06-Jun-15	3	245	mm	370	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE
Pepper Park Pier	SDBS-9-SSB	Spotted sand bass	06-Jun-15	4	231	mm	309.9	g	Fish fillet without skin	TRUE

APPENDIX I. SPORT FISH TISSUE CHEMISTRY.

Table I1. Sample identifiers and contaminant concentrations for sport fish composites.

Location	SampleID	CommonName	SampleDate	Chlordanes ng/g ww	DDTs ng/g ww	Dieldrin ng/g ww	PCBs ng/g ww	Mercury ng/g ww
San Diego Bay North	SDBS-1-CH	California halibut	6/6/2015	0.05	2.88	0.05	32.96	95.07
San Diego Bay North	SDBS-2-CH	California halibut	6/6/2015	0.04	1.21	0.05	3.38	68.33
San Diego Bay North	SDBS-1-PCM	Pacific chub mackerel	6/6/2015	1.11	9.48	0.05	86.74	51.91
San Diego Bay North	SDBS-2-PCM	Pacific chub mackerel	6/6/2015	0.23	3.82	0.05	23.12	76.16
San Diego Bay North	SDBS-1-RSR	Round stingray	6/6/2015	0.17	0.05	0.05	36.43	186.84
San Diego Bay North	SDBS-2-RSR	Round stingray	6/6/2015	0.05	0.05	0.05	8.05	232.06
San Diego Bay North	SDBS-1-SSB	Spotted sand bass	9/25/2014	0.19	0.59	0.05	25.61	196.02
San Diego Bay North	SDBS-2-SSB	Spotted sand bass	6/6/2015	0.38	1.70	0.05	30.66	231.67
San Diego Bay North	SDBS-3-SSB	Spotted sand bass	6/6/2015	0.29	1.44	0.05	42.60	207.94
San Diego Bay North	SDBS-4-SSB	Spotted sand bass	6/6/2015	0.14	6.87	0.05	33.48	241.42
San Diego Bay North	SDBS-8-SSB	Spotted sand bass	6/6/2015	0.03	1.03	0.05	25.39	186.91
San Diego Bay Central	SDBS-3-CH	California halibut	10/14/2014	0.05	0.39	0.05	7.23	272.73
San Diego Bay Central	SDBS-4-CH	California halibut	12/10/2014	0.05	0.77	0.05	11.15	88.84
San Diego Bay Central	SDBS-5-CH	California halibut	6/6/2015	0.05	1.20	0.05	18.21	103.06
San Diego Bay Central	SDBS-7-CH	California halibut	7/4/2015	0.05	1.78	0.05	17.16	205.45
San Diego Bay Central	SDBS-8-CH	California halibut	7/5/2015	0.05	0.99	0.05	12.40	173.22
San Diego Bay Central	SDBS-5-SSB	Spotted sand bass	12/10/2014	0.18	0.72	0.05	31.39	157.52
San Diego Bay Central	SDBS-6-SSB	Spotted sand bass	12/10/2014	0.05	0.36	0.05	29.82	171.59
San Diego Bay Central	SDBS-7-SSB	Spotted sand bass	6/6/2015	0.05	0.71	0.05	48.58	213.01
San Diego Bay South	SDBS-6-CH	California halibut	12/10/2014	0.05	0.93	0.05	14.44	147.04
San Diego Bay South	SDBS-3-PCM	Pacific chub mackerel	6/6/2015	2.01	17.73	0.05	202.13	214.07
San Diego Bay South	SDBS-10-SSB	Spotted sand bass	10/14/2014	0.07	0.49	0.05	5.72	143.83
San Diego Bay South	SDBS-9-SSB	Spotted sand bass	6/6/2015	0.18	0.99	0.05	20.40	172.52
San Diego Bay South	SDBS-2-TS	Topsmelt	6/6/2015	0.34	3.03	0.05	34.67	29.73