

Appendix B
Questionnaire Response Database

1. Did your state or tribal agency conduct monitoring during this past year (2010) to obtain information about the concentrations of chemical contaminants in fish tissue for assessing human health risks?

Yes 45

No 11

| State/Tribe | Response | |
|-------------|----------|----|
| AK | Yes | — |
| AL | Yes | — |
| AR | Yes | — |
| AZ | Yes | — |
| CA | Yes | — |
| CO | Yes | — |
| CT | Yes | — |
| DC | Yes | — |
| DE | — | No |
| FL | Yes | — |
| GA | Yes | — |
| GLIFWC | Yes | — |
| GU | Yes | — |
| HI | — | No |
| IA | Yes | — |
| ID | — | No |
| IL | Yes | — |
| IN | Yes | — |
| KS | Yes | — |

| State/Tribe | Response | |
|-------------|----------|----|
| KY | Yes | — |
| LA | Yes | — |
| MA | Yes | — |
| MD | Yes | — |
| ME | Yes | — |
| ME ABM | — | No |
| MI | Yes | — |
| MN | Yes | — |
| MO | Yes | — |
| MS | Yes | — |
| MT | Yes | — |
| NC | Yes | — |
| ND | — | No |
| NE | Yes | — |
| NH | Yes | — |
| NJ | Yes | — |
| NM | Yes | — |
| NV | Yes | — |
| NY | Yes | — |

| State/Tribe | Response | |
|-------------|----------|----|
| NY SRMT | — | No |
| OH | Yes | — |
| OK | Yes | — |
| OR | — | No |
| PA | Yes | — |
| RI | — | No |
| SC | Yes | — |
| SD | Yes | — |
| SD CRST | — | No |
| TN | Yes | — |
| TX | Yes | — |
| UT | Yes | — |
| VA | — | No |
| VT | — | No |
| WA | Yes | — |
| WI | Yes | — |
| WV | Yes | — |
| WY | Yes | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

2. What kind of data does your state or tribal agency collect to evaluate chemical contaminant levels in fish?

| | |
|--|----|
| Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | 55 |
| Monitors water quality and uses data to estimate contaminant concentrations in fish | 5 |
| Monitors sediments and uses data to estimate contaminant concentrations in fish | 1 |
| Other methods (please specify) | 4 |

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify |
|-----------------|--|---|-----|--------------------------------|---|
| AK | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | Monitors water quality and uses data to estimate contaminant concentrations in fish | | | — |
| AL | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| AR | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| AZ | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| CA | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| CO | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| CT | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | Other methods (please specify) | Water and sediment data can trigger fish sampling |
| DC | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |

2. What kind of data does your state or tribal agency collect to evaluate chemical contaminant levels in fish? (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify |
|-----------------|--|---|-----|--------------------------------|---|
| DE | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| FL | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | Other methods (please specify) | Continue to conduct water quality and fish contaminant data to try to develop relationships as in second box above. |
| GA | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| GLIFWC | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| GU | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| HI | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| IA | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | Monitors water quality and uses data to estimate contaminant concentrations in fish | | — | — |
| ID | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | sampling only carried out when funds are available |
| IL | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| IN | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |

2. What kind of data does your state or tribal agency collect to evaluate chemical contaminant levels in fish? (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify |
|-----------------|--|---|-----|--------------------------------|--|
| KS | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | We have monitored sediment and tissues from crayfish, freshwater mussels, and clams, resulting data used to issue crayfish/shellfish advisory for heavy metals in South East Kansas. |
| KY | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| LA | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| MA | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| MD | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | Other methods (please specify) | If bioaccumulatable substances are found in samples from other studies/agencies' those areas may be targeted for fish tissue monitoring (if resources allow) |
| ME | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| ME ABM | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | Monitors water quality and uses data to estimate contaminant concentrations in fish | | | — |
| MI | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| MN | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |

2. What kind of data does your state or tribal agency collect to evaluate chemical contaminant levels in fish? (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify |
|-----------------|--|-----|---|---------|---------|
| MO | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| MS | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| MT | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | Monitors sediments and uses data to estimate contaminant concentrations in fish | | |
| NC | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| ND | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| NE | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| NH | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| NJ | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| NM | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| NV | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |

2. What kind of data does your state or tribal agency collect to evaluate chemical contaminant levels in fish? (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify |
|-----------------|--|---|-----|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| NY | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| NY SRMT | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| OH | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| OK | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| OR | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | work done by Oregon DEQ |
| PA | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| RI | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| SC | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| SD | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| SD CRST | — | Monitors water quality and uses data to estimate contaminant concentrations in fish | | Other methods (please specify) | Bio-monitoring |
| TN | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |

2. What kind of data does your state or tribal agency collect to evaluate chemical contaminant levels in fish? (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify |
|-----------------|--|---|-----|---------|--------------------|
| TX | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| UT | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| VA | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| VT | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | no samples in 2010 |
| WA | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | Monitors water quality and uses data to estimate contaminant concentrations in fish | | — | |
| WI | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| WV | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |
| WY | Captures fish and sends tissues to a lab to determine contaminant concentrations | — | — | — | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

3. How does your state or tribe conduct monitoring of contaminants in fish tissue for fish advisories?

| | |
|--|----|
| Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | 45 |
| Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | 40 |
| Other methods (please specify) | 19 |

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R_Other | Specify |
|-----------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| AK | — | — | Other methods (please specify) | Monitors general fishing areas usually on an annual basis; collecting different species of fishes. Also conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas or watersheds |
| AL | — | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | Other methods (please specify) | monitors same areas on a yearly basis if violative contaminant level is found |
| AR | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | — | Other methods (please specify) | Monitor high use areas, and areas of special concern |
| AZ | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | — | — |
| CA | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | — | — |
| CO | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | — | — | — |
| CT | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | Other methods (please specify) | More regular monitoring of highly impacted (or suspected) waterbodies |
| DC | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | — | — | — |

3. How does your state or tribe conduct monitoring of contaminants in fish tissue for fish advisories? (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R_Other | Specify |
|-----------------|---|---|--------------------------------|--|
| DE | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | — | — | — |
| FL | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | Other methods (please specify) | Periodic monitoring of a subset of sites (17) |
| GA | — | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | — | — |
| GLIFWC | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | — | — |
| GU | — | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | Other methods (please specify) | The program plan calls for monitoring of sites throughout Guam at regular interval. Increased sample and analysis may be conducted, based on identification of contaminates. |
| HI | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | — | — | — |
| IA | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | — | — |
| ID | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | — | — | sampling only carried out when funds are available |
| IL | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | — | — |
| IN | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | Other methods (please specify) | 5 year statewide rotation in surface waters monitoring strategy |

3. How does your state or tribe conduct monitoring of contaminants in fish tissue for fish advisories? (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R_Other | Specify |
|-----------------|---|---|--------------------------------|---|
| KS | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | Other methods (please specify) | Probability based sampling of streams and smaller public lakes |
| KY | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | — | — |
| LA | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | — | — |
| MA | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | Other methods (please specify) | Public requests, watershed studies, waste-site related |
| MD | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | Other methods (please specify) | Use other data that meet QA/QC custody requirements |
| ME | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | — | — |
| ME ABM | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | — | — | — |
| MI | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | Other methods (please specify) | Prioritizes sites based on known or suspected contamination, public access, and ability to collect fish |
| MN | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | — | — |
| MO | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | — | — |

3. How does your state or tribe conduct monitoring of contaminants in fish tissue for fish advisories? (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R_Other | Specify |
|-----------------|---|---|--------------------------------|--|
| MS | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | Other methods (please specify) | Annual rotating basis |
| MT | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | — | — |
| NC | — | — | Other methods (please specify) | Targets high risk areas |
| ND | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | — | — |
| NE | — | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | Other methods (please specify) | Fish tissue monitoring efforts are annually concentrated in two to three of Nebraska's 13 major river basins. These efforts within the targeted basins are repeated every six years. |
| NH | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | — | Other methods (please specify) | Volunteers submit samples for analysis. |
| NJ | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | — | — | — |
| NM | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | — | — |
| NV | — | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | — | — |
| NY | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | — | — |

3. How does your state or tribe conduct monitoring of contaminants in fish tissue for fish advisories? (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R_Other | Specify |
|-----------------|---|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| NY SRMT | — | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | — | — |
| OH | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | — | — |
| OK | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | — | — |
| OR | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | — | — | work done by Oregon DEQ |
| PA | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | — | — |
| RI | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | — | — | — |
| SC | — | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | — | — |
| SD | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | — | — |
| SD CRST | — | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | — | — |
| TN | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | Other methods (please specify) | Uses data collected by TVA, DOE |

3. How does your state or tribe conduct monitoring of contaminants in fish tissue for fish advisories? (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R_Other | Specify |
|-----------------|---|---|--------------------------------|---|
| TX | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | — | Other methods (please specify) | Water bodies with fish consumption advisories may be reevaluated through multiple surveys. However, routine monitoring is dependent upon available funding. |
| UT | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | — | — | — |
| VA | — | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | — | — |
| VT | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | — | no monitoring was conducted in 2010 |
| WA | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | Other methods (please specify) | Conducts commercial fish sampling (when funding allows) |
| WI | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | — | — |
| WV | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | Monitors the same fishing areas, watersheds, or basins at regular intervals | Other methods (please specify) | Conducting statewide sampling for PCB's and Mercury during 2002 and 2004. |
| WY | Conducts one-time, nonrecurring or special surveys in particular fishing areas, watersheds, or basins | — | — | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

4. During the past year, please estimate the number of stations from which your state or tribal agency collected fish tissue that was analyzed for chemical contaminants and was used for the fish advisory program.

| | | | |
|-----------------------|----|---|----|
| 0 stations | 8 | 31–50 stations | 10 |
| 1–10 stations | 17 | 51–100 stations | 9 |
| 11–20 stations | 3 | >100 stations (please specify number) | 3 |
| 21–30 stations | 6 | | |

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | Specify |
|--------------|------------|---------------|----------------|-----|----------------|-----------------|-----|--|
| AK | — | — | — | — | — | 51–100 stations | — | — |
| AL | — | — | — | — | 31–50 stations | — | — | — |
| AR | — | — | 11–20 stations | — | — | — | — | — |
| AZ | — | 1–10 stations | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| CA | — | 1–10 stations | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| CO | — | 1–10 stations | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| CT | — | 1–10 stations | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| DC | — | 1–10 stations | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| DE | 0 stations | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| FL | — | — | — | — | — | 51–100 stations | — | 66 sites + 100 for other research projects |
| GA | — | 1–10 stations | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | 1–10 stations | — | — | — | — | — | Walleye from inland lakes of WI & MN |
| GU | — | 1–10 stations | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| HI | 0 stations | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| IA | — | — | — | — | 31–50 stations | — | — | — |
| ID | 0 stations | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| IL | — | — | — | — | — | 51–100 stations | — | — |
| IN | — | 1–10 stations | — | — | — | — | — | — |

4. During the past year, please estimate the number of stations from which your state or tribal agency collected fish tissue that was analyzed for chemical contaminants and was used for the fish advisory program. (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | Specify |
|--------------|------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|--|---------|
| KS | — | — | — | — | 31–50 stations | — | — | — |
| KY | — | 1–10 stations | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| LA | — | — | — | — | — | 51–100 stations | — | — |
| MA | — | — | — | — | 31–50 stations | — | — | — |
| MD | — | — | — | 21–30 stations | — | — | — | — |
| ME | — | — | — | — | 31–50 stations | — | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | 1–10 stations | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MI | — | — | — | — | 31–50 stations | — | — | — |
| MN | — | — | — | — | — | — | >100 stations (please specify number) | — |
| MO | — | — | — | — | — | 51–100 stations | — | — |
| MS | — | — | — | 21–30 stations | — | — | — | — |
| MT | — | 1–10 stations | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NC | — | — | — | — | 31–50 stations | — | — | — |
| ND | 0 stations | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NE | — | — | — | — | 31–50 stations | — | — | — |
| NH | — | 1–10 stations | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NJ | — | — | — | — | 31–50 stations | — | — | — |
| NM | — | 1–10 stations | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NV | — | — | — | 21–30 stations | — | — | — | — |
| NY | — | — | — | — | — | 51–100 stations | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | 1–10 stations | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| OH | — | — | — | — | — | 51–100 stations | — | — |
| OK | — | — | 11–20 stations | — | — | — | — | — |
| OR | — | 1–10 stations | — | — | — | — | — | — |

4. During the past year, please estimate the number of stations from which your state or tribal agency collected fish tissue that was analyzed for chemical contaminants and was used for the fish advisory program. (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | Specify |
|--------------|------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|---|--|
| PA | — | — | — | — | — | 51–100 stations | — | — |
| RI | 0 stations | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| SC | — | — | — | — | — | — | >100 stations (please specify number) | — |
| SD | — | — | 11–20 stations | — | — | — | — | — |
| SD CRST | 0 stations | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| TN | — | — | — | 21–30 stations | — | — | — | Some stations collected by regulated agencies and submitted to state |
| TX | — | — | — | — | 31–50 stations | — | — | — |
| UT | — | — | — | 21–30 stations | — | — | — | — |
| VA | 0 stations | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| VT | 0 stations | — | — | — | — | — | — | no collections occurred in 2010 |
| WA | — | — | — | — | — | — | >100 stations (please specify number) | unknown |
| WI | — | — | — | — | — | 51–100 stations | — | number of sites for 2009, 2010 data not yet complete |
| WV | — | — | — | 21–30 stations | — | — | — | — |
| WY | — | 1–10 stations | — | — | — | — | — | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

5. How frequently does your state resample fish from waterbodies where advisories are in effect?

| | | | |
|----------------------|---|--|----|
| Every year | 5 | Every 5 years | 5 |
| Every 2 years | 2 | Every 6 -10 years | 2 |
| Every 3 years | 2 | On an as needed basis (no set schedule) | 18 |
| Every 4 years | 0 | Not applicable | 2 |

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify |
|-----------------|------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---------------------------------|--|
| AK | — | — | — | — | — | — | On an as needed basis (no set schedule) | — | — |
| AL | Every year | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| AR | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other schedule (please specify) | Some locations are sampled annually and others are sampled when contamination is suspected |
| AZ | — | — | — | — | — | — | On an as needed basis (no set schedule) | — | — |
| CA | — | — | — | — | — | — | On an as needed basis (no set schedule) | — | — |
| CO | — | — | — | — | — | — | On an as needed basis (no set schedule) | — | — |
| CT | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other schedule (please specify) | Every 2–4 years |
| DC | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other schedule (please specify) | Frequency depends on the availability of funds |

5. How frequently does your state resample fish from waterbodies where advisories are in effect? (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify |
|-----------------|-----|-----|------------------|-----|------------------|-----|---|--|---|
| DE | — | — | — | — | Every 5 years | — | — | — | — |
| FL | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other schedule (please specify) | Re-sample existing advisory waterbodies every 7 years |
| GA | — | — | — | — | — | — | On an as needed basis (no set schedule) | — | 4-5 year cycle |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other schedule (please specify) | Some lakes annually, others every 2 years and others as needed |
| GU | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other schedule (please specify) | Currently Guam has fish advisories that are the responsibility of Department of Defense. They currently re- sample every five (5) years. When GEPA's fish-shellfish monitoring program is in full swing we anticipate to conduct annual analysis. |
| HI | — | — | — | — | — | — | On an as needed basis (no set schedule) | — | — |
| IA | — | — | Every 3 years | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| ID | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other schedule (please specify) | Idaho has no funds specific to resampling so there is no schedule to do so. |

5. How frequently does your state resample fish from waterbodies where advisories are in effect? (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify |
|-----------------|------------|---------------|---------------|-----|---------------|-----|---|---------------------------------|--|
| IL | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other schedule (please specify) | Every year for L. Michigan, every 2–4 years for other waters |
| IN | — | — | — | — | Every 5 years | — | — | — | — |
| KS | Every year | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| KY | — | — | Every 3 years | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| LA | — | Every 2 years | — | — | — | — | — | — | when funding permits |
| MA | — | — | — | — | — | — | On an as needed basis (no set schedule) | — | — |
| MD | — | — | — | — | Every 5 years | — | — | — | The Maryland Fish Consumption Advisory Program has divided the state into 5 regions and samples core sites within the regions on a 5 year cycle. During any given year, areas of the four regions not scheduled to be sampled may be sampled due to special pr |
| ME | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other schedule (please specify) | Annually for river specific advisories. Less than annually for the statewide mercury advisory |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | — | — | On an as needed basis (no set schedule) | — | — |

5. How frequently does your state resample fish from waterbodies where advisories are in effect? (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify |
|-----------------|------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---------------------------------|--|
| MI | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other schedule (please specify) | Frequency ranges from annually to 10 years and is dependent on the waterbody, contaminant, contaminant source, public access and popularity of waterbody. Remote lakes with elevated Hg are not resampled as frequently as urban waterbodies influenced by con |
| MN | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other schedule (please specify) | some waters are one time surveys, others are on a rotation |
| MO | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other schedule (please specify) | Most sites are sampled annually, but some sites are sampled less than annually. Missouri DNR samples fixed sites every two years and discretionary sites may be sampled on schedule that is longer than 2 years. Missouri Dept. of Conservation may focus on a |
| MS | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other schedule (please specify) | Less Frequently than annually; however, once an advisory has been in place for a while and concentrations appear to be stable, we reduce sampling frequency to once per 2–3 years. |
| MT | — | — | — | — | — | — | On an as needed basis (no set schedule) | — | — |
| NC | Every year | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 1 to 5 years |

5. How frequently does your state resample fish from waterbodies where advisories are in effect? (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify |
|-----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------------|----------------------|---|--|--|
| ND | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other schedule (please specify) | Every 3–5 years |
| NE | — | — | — | — | — | Every 6 –10 years | — | — | Nebraska recently switched from a five year basin rotation cycle to a six year to achieve better coverage in certain areas of the state. |
| NH | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other schedule (please specify) | Frequency of sampling is based on waterbody and advisory in question. |
| NJ | — | — | — | — | Every 5 years | — | — | — | — |
| NM | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other schedule (please specify) | As needed, but also concurrent with our watershed-based water quality surveys conducted on an approximately 8 year rotation. |
| NV | — | — | — | — | — | — | On an as needed basis (no set schedule) | — | — |
| NY | — | — | — | — | — | — | On an as needed basis (no set schedule) | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | — | — | — | — | — | On an as needed basis (no set schedule) | — | — |
| OH | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other schedule (please specify) | Approximately once every five years, although more frequently, if needed |

5. How frequently does your state resample fish from waterbodies where advisories are in effect? (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify |
|-----------------|------------|---------------|-----|-----|---------------|-----|---|---------------------------------|--|
| OK | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other schedule (please specify) | It depends on the contaminant and the level relative to the consumption advisory level. For lead, no plans to resample. For DDT, annually. For mercury, every 2–3 years. |
| OR | — | — | — | — | — | — | On an as needed basis (no set schedule) | — | — |
| PA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other schedule (please specify) | Every 2 – 5 years |
| RI | — | — | — | — | — | — | On an as needed basis (no set schedule) | — | — |
| SC | Every year | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| SD | — | — | — | — | Every 5 years | — | — | — | — |
| SD CRST | — | Every 2 years | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| TN | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other schedule (please specify) | Every 1–5 years |
| TX | — | — | — | — | — | — | On an as needed basis (no set schedule) | — | — |
| UT | — | — | — | — | — | — | On an as needed basis (no set schedule) | — | — |
| VA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | rotating basis; currently no funds |

5. How frequently does your state resample fish from waterbodies where advisories are in effect? (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify |
|-----------------|------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---------------------------------|--|
| VT | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other schedule (please specify) | Every 5 years in the case of Lake Champlain, sometimes annually depending on the data gaps we have for other species and waterbodies. |
| WA | — | — | — | — | — | — | On an as needed basis (no set schedule) | — | — |
| WI | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other schedule (please specify) | Every 5 years for PCB special advisory sites, every 10 to 15 years for special mercury sites. For other waters under the general advisory, the sample frequency ranges from a onetime sampling up to an approximate 15 year return time. In addition, specific |
| WV | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other schedule (please specify) | Resampling is conducted as funding permits. The Ohio River is resampled annually by a private agency. |
| WY | Every year | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

6. In approximately how many waterbodies was fish tissue monitoring conducted within your state during the past year?

| | | | |
|--------------------------|----|---|----|
| 0 waterbodies | 7 | 21–30 waterbodies | 10 |
| 1–10 waterbodies | 19 | 31–40 waterbodies | 6 |
| 11–20 waterbodies | 7 | >40 (please specify total number sampled) | 7 |

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R_Other | Specify |
|-----------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---|---------|
| AK | — | — | — | 21–30 waterbodies | — | — | — |
| AL | — | — | 11–20 waterbodies | — | — | — | — |
| AR | — | — | 11–20 waterbodies | — | — | — | — |
| AZ | — | 1–10 waterbodies | — | — | — | — | — |
| CA | — | — | — | — | 31–40 waterbodies | — | — |
| CO | — | 1–10 waterbodies | — | — | — | — | — |
| CT | — | 1–10 waterbodies | — | — | — | — | — |
| DC | — | 1–10 waterbodies | — | — | — | — | — |
| DE | 0 waterbodies | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| FL | — | — | — | — | — | >40 (please specify total number sampled) | 166 |
| GA | — | 1–10 waterbodies | — | — | — | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | 1–10 waterbodies | — | — | — | — | — |
| GU | — | 1–10 waterbodies | — | — | — | — | — |
| HI | 0 waterbodies | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| IA | — | — | — | — | 31–40 waterbodies | — | — |
| ID | 0 waterbodies | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| IL | — | — | — | — | — | >40 (please specify total number sampled) | 50 |
| IN | — | — | — | 21–30 waterbodies | — | — | — |
| KS | — | — | — | — | 31–40 waterbodies | — | — |

6. In approximately how many waterbodies was fish tissue monitoring conducted within your state during the past year? (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R_Other | Specify |
|-----------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---|---|
| KY | — | 1–10 waterbodies | — | — | — | — | — |
| LA | — | 1–10 waterbodies | — | — | — | — | extensive monitoring of gulf (bp spill) |
| MA | — | — | — | 21–30 waterbodies | — | — | — |
| MD | — | — | 11–20 waterbodies | — | — | — | — |
| ME | — | — | — | 21–30 waterbodies | — | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | 1–10 waterbodies | — | — | — | — | — |
| MI | — | — | — | — | 31–40 waterbodies | — | — |
| MN | — | — | — | — | — | >40 (please specify total number sampled) | 80 |
| MO | — | — | — | — | — | >40 (please specify total number sampled) | — |
| MS | — | — | 11–20 waterbodies | — | — | — | — |
| MT | — | 1–10 waterbodies | — | — | — | — | — |
| NC | — | — | — | 21–30 waterbodies | — | — | — |
| ND | 0 waterbodies | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NE | — | — | — | — | — | >40 (please specify total number sampled) | 47 |
| NH | — | — | — | 21–30 waterbodies | — | — | — |
| NJ | — | — | — | — | 31–40 waterbodies | — | — |
| NM | — | 1–10 waterbodies | — | — | — | — | — |
| NV | — | 1–10 waterbodies | — | — | — | — | — |
| NY | — | — | — | — | 31–40 waterbodies | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | 1–10 waterbodies | — | — | — | — | — |
| OH | — | — | — | 21–30 waterbodies | — | — | — |

6. In approximately how many waterbodies was fish tissue monitoring conducted within your state during the past year? (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R_Other | Specify |
|-----------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----|---|---------------------------------|
| OK | — | — | 11–20 waterbodies | — | — | — | — |
| OR | — | 1–10 waterbodies | — | — | — | — | — |
| PA | — | — | — | — | — | >40 (please specify total number sampled) | 74 |
| RI | 0 waterbodies | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| SC | — | — | — | — | — | >40 (please specify total number sampled) | — |
| SD | — | — | 11–20 waterbodies | — | — | — | — |
| SD CRST | — | 1–10 waterbodies | — | — | — | — | — |
| TN | — | 1–10 waterbodies | — | — | — | — | — |
| TX | — | 1–10 waterbodies | — | — | — | — | — |
| UT | — | — | — | 21–30 waterbodies | — | — | — |
| VA | 0 waterbodies | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| VT | 0 waterbodies | — | — | — | — | — | no collections occurred in 2010 |
| WA | — | — | 11–20 waterbodies | — | — | — | — |
| WI | — | — | — | 21–30 waterbodies | — | — | — |
| WV | — | — | — | 21–30 waterbodies | — | — | — |
| WY | — | 1–10 waterbodies | — | — | — | — | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

7. How does your state determine which sites to monitor?

| | | | |
|---|----|--------------------------------------|----|
| Accessibility of site | 17 | Fixed-station sites | 31 |
| Area of concern | 35 | Randomly selected sites | 26 |
| Citizen or Agency request | 28 | Major fishery resource | 27 |
| Degree of angling pressure the site receives | 46 | Other method (please specify) | 19 |
| High pollution potential at the site | 49 | Not applicable | 1 |

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R08 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---------|------|
| AK | Accessibility of site | Area of concern | Citizen or Agency request | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | | Major fishery resource | | | — | |
| AL | — | — | — | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | Randomly selected sites | Other method (please specify) | Basin Rotation over 5-yr period | | |
| AR | — | Area of concern | Citizen or Agency request | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | | Randomly selected sites | | — | — | |
| AZ | Accessibility of site | Area of concern | Citizen or Agency request | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | | Major fishery resource | | | — | |
| CA | Accessibility of site | | — | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | Randomly selected sites | Major fishery resource | | | — | |
| CO | — | — | Citizen or Agency request | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | | Randomly selected sites | Other method (please specify) | In addition to new sites, we target sites with data greater than 10 years old and also monitor sites where TMDL's are required. | | | |
| CT | Accessibility of site | Area of concern | | — | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | Randomly selected sites | | — | — | |

7. How does your state determine which sites to monitor? (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R08 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|------|
| DC | — | — | — | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | Fixed-station sites | | — | — | — | — | — |
| DE | Accessibility of site | | — | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | | | — | — | — | — |
| FL | Accessibility of site | Area of concern | Citizen or Agency request | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | Randomly selected sites | Major fishery resource | Other method (please specify) | Major water bodies | |
| GA | — | — | Citizen or Agency request | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | | Major fishery resource | | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | Area of concern | Citizen or Agency request | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | | Fixed-station sites | | Major fishery resource | Other method (please specify) | Lakes without samples | |
| GU | — | Area of concern | | — | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | Randomly selected sites | Major fishery resource | | | — |
| HI | — | Area of concern | Citizen or Agency request | | High pollution potential at the site | | | Major fishery resource | | — | — |
| IA | — | Area of concern | Citizen or Agency request | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | Randomly selected sites | | Major fishery resource | | — | — |
| ID | — | — | Citizen or Agency request | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | Randomly selected sites | | Other method (please specify) | sampling only carried out when funds are available | | |
| IL | — | — | — | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | | — | Other method (please specify) | Fishable stream stations selected during annual Basin Intensive Surveys | |

7. How does your state determine which sites to monitor? (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R08 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---------|------|
| IN | — | Area of concern | | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | Randomly selected sites | | — | — | — |
| KS | — | Area of concern | Citizen or Agency request | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | Randomly selected sites | Major fishery resource | | — | — |
| KY | — | Area of concern | Citizen or Agency request | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | Randomly selected sites | Other method (please specify) | Probabilistic Survey Design | | — |
| LA | — | — | — | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | Randomly selected sites | Other method (please specify) | WATER AND SEDIMENT SAMPLES INDICATE THAT THERE MAY BE A PROBLEM | | — |
| MA | Accessibility of site | Area of concern | Citizen or Agency request | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | | — | — | — | — |
| MD | — | Area of concern | | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | | — | — | — | — |
| ME | — | — | — | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | | — | — | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | Area of concern | Citizen or Agency request | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | | | Major fishery resource | | — | — | — |
| MI | — | — | Citizen or Agency request | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | Randomly selected sites | Other method (please specify) | public access, ability to collect fish | | — |

7. How does your state determine which sites to monitor? (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R08 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|---|------|
| MN | Accessibility of site | Area of concern | Citizen or Agency request | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | Randomly selected sites | Major fishery resource | Other method (please specify) | Specific scientific studies | |
| MO | Accessibility of site | Area of concern | Citizen or Agency request | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | Randomly selected sites | Major fishery resource | Other method (please specify) | EPA requested sampling through the Regional Ambient Fish Tissue Monitoring Program | |
| MS | — | — | — | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | Randomly selected sites | | | | |
| MT | — | Area of concern | Citizen or Agency request | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | | | Major fishery resource | Other method (please specify) | 90% of sites are lakes, first those known to be high harvest/consumption sources, and secondly those known to have been exposed to environmental challenge in recent past. Just 2 streams sampled: those 2 known to be exposed to mining/smelting waste or PC | |
| NC | — | — | — | — | High pollution potential at the site | | | | | | |
| ND | — | — | — | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | | | | Other method (please specify) | as many lakes and rivers as practical given available resources and our Game and Fish Department's routine population survey netting schedule | |

7. How does your state determine which sites to monitor? (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R08 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|---|------|
| NE | — | — | — | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | | Major fishery resource | Other method (please specify) | Other: Stream segments and/or lakes where the State has not monitored (water column, aquatic community, habitat or fish tissue) previously are sometimes targeted for sampling. | |
| NH | — | — | Citizen or Agency request | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | Randomly selected sites | | — | — | |
| NJ | Accessibility of site | Area of concern | | — | High pollution potential at the site | — | Randomly selected sites | Major fishery resource | | — | |
| NM | — | Area of concern | | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | | | — | — | — | |
| NV | — | — | Citizen or Agency request | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | | Fixed-station sites | Randomly selected sites | | — | — | |
| NY | — | — | — | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | | — | — | — | |
| NY SRMT | | Area of concern | | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | — | Randomly selected sites | Major fishery resource | | — | |
| OH | Accessibility of site | Area of concern | Citizen or Agency request | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | Randomly selected sites | Major fishery resource | | — | |
| OK | — | Area of concern | Citizen or Agency request | | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | | Major fishery resource | | — | |

7. How does your state determine which sites to monitor? (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R08 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|--|------|
| OR | Accessibility of site | Area of concern | Citizen or Agency request | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | | | Major fishery resource | | | — |
| PA | — | Area of concern | | — | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | | — | Other method (please specify) | Where there are existing advisories, and locally determined priority areas | |
| RI | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other method (please specify) | Take advantage of research or surveillance projects already conducting fish sampling/testing | |
| SC | — | — | — | — | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | Randomly selected sites | | — | — | |
| SD | Accessibility of site | Area of concern | Citizen or Agency request | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | | | Major fishery resource | | | — |
| SD CRST | Accessibility of site | Area of concern | Citizen or Agency request | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | | | Major fishery resource | | | — |
| TN | — | Area of concern | | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | | Major fishery resource | | | — |
| TX | Accessibility of site | Area of concern | | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | | | Major fishery resource | Other method (please specify) | DSSH uses data collected by other state or federal agencies that identify potential site(s). | |
| UT | — | Area of concern | | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | | | | | Other method (please specify) | Availability of sampling staff being at location of interest | |

7. How does your state determine which sites to monitor? (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R08 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|---|----------------|
| VA | Accessibility of site | Area of concern | Citizen or Agency request | | High pollution potential at the site | | | | — | Historical data review | |
| VT | — | Area of concern | | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | Randomly selected sites | | | Unlike other years, in 2008 we received samples from a variety of locations where other efforts being conducted. Usually we are options 4-7. No samples have been collected since 2008. | Not applicable |
| WA | — | Area of concern | Citizen or Agency request | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | Randomly selected sites | Major fishery resource | Other method (please specify) | Ambient monitoring programs w/ random selection | |
| WI | Accessibility of site | Area of concern | Citizen or Agency request | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | Fixed-station sites | Randomly selected sites | Major fishery resource | | — | |
| WV | — | — | — | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | | | | — | — | — |
| WY | — | Area of concern | | Degree of angling pressure the site receives | High pollution potential at the site | | Major fishery resource | | | — | |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

8. How many river, stream, or canal miles were assessed at least once during the last 3 years specifically for the fish advisory program?

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|----|----------------------|---|
| Do not collect/Could not calculate | 3 | 1,000 to 2,000 miles | 8 |
| 0 miles | 13 | > 2,000 miles | 5 |
| 1 to 999 miles | 27 | | |

| State/Tribe | Response |
|-------------|----------|
| AK | 1,000 |
| AL | 175 |
| AR | 50 |
| AZ | 65 |
| CA | 565 |
| CO | 0 |
| CT | 100 |
| DC | 36.4 |
| DE | 86.9 |
| FL | 4,087 |
| GA | 0 |
| GLIFWC | 0 |
| GU | 0 |
| HI | 0 |
| IA | 1,800 |
| ID | 0 |
| IL | 5,066 |
| IN | 0 |
| KS | 4,511 |

| State/Tribe | Response |
|-------------|--------------------------------------|
| KY | 120 |
| LA | 0 |
| MA | 8 |
| MD | 45 |
| ME | 1,000 |
| ME ABM | 3 |
| MI | 1,000 |
| MN | Don't keep track of this information |
| MO | 1,000 |
| MS | 428 |
| MT | 60 |
| NC | 300 |
| ND | 399 |
| NE | 1,420 |
| NH | 78 |
| NJ | 25 |
| NM | 170 |
| NV | 60 |
| NY | Unknown |

| State/Tribe | Response |
|-------------|---|
| NY SRMT | 10 |
| OH | 1,052 |
| OK | 75 |
| OR | 0 |
| PA | 505 |
| RI | 0 |
| SC | 2,100 |
| SD | 160 |
| SD CRST | 15 |
| TN | 329 |
| TX | 675 |
| UT | 0 |
| VA | 4,722 |
| VT | 0 |
| WA | 300 |
| WI | This information would take too much of my time to compile. |
| WV | 1,997 |
| WY | 0 |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

9. How many lake or reservoir acres were assessed at least once during the past 3 years specifically for the fish advisory program?

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|----|----------------------------|----|
| Do not collect/Could not calculate | 3 | 100,000 to 1 million acres | 13 |
| 0 acres | 12 | > 1 million acres | 1 |
| 1 to 99,999 acres | 27 | | |

| State/Tribe | Response |
|-------------|-----------|
| AK | 0 |
| AL | 1,000 |
| AR | 15 |
| AZ | 870 |
| CA | 12,002 |
| CO | 19,973 |
| CT | 1,000 |
| DC | 238.4 |
| DE | 299.6 |
| FL | 877,197 |
| GA | 0 |
| GLIFWC | 233,104 |
| GU | 0 |
| HI | 400 |
| IA | 72,000 |
| ID | 0 |
| IL | 1,076,193 |
| IN | 0 |
| KS | 129,624 |

| State/Tribe | Response |
|-------------|--------------------------------------|
| KY | 232,473 |
| LA | 0 |
| MA | 5,298 |
| MD | 45 |
| ME | 100,000 |
| ME ABM | 0 |
| MI | 10,000 |
| MN | Don't keep track of this information |
| MO | 100,000 |
| MS | 36,850 |
| MT | 300,000 |
| NC | 1,000 |
| ND | 493,231 |
| NE | 51,061 |
| NH | 65,890 |
| NJ | 9,500 |
| NM | 18,172 |
| NV | 108,891 |
| NY | Unknown |

| State/Tribe | Response |
|-------------|---|
| NY SRMT | 0 |
| OH | 25,410 |
| OK | 350,000 |
| OR | 0 |
| PA | 2,454 |
| RI | 0 |
| SC | 420,933 |
| SD | 31,000 |
| SD CRST | 30 |
| TN | 154,045 |
| TX | 138,535 |
| UT | 0 |
| VA | 96,134 |
| VT | 0 |
| WA | 40,000 |
| WI | This information would take too much of my time to compile. |
| WV | 8,123 |
| WY | 80,000 |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

10. How many square miles of estuarine waters were assessed at least once during the past 3 years specifically for the fish advisory program?

Do not collect/could not calculate 2
0 square miles 39
1-999 square miles 11

> 1,000 square miles 3
Not Applicable 1

| State/Tribe | Response | Notes |
|-------------|----------|--------------------------------------|
| AK | 0 | — |
| AL | 135 | — |
| AR | 0 | — |
| AZ | 0 | — |
| CA | 755 | Converted from acre 483,400 acres |
| CO | 0 | — |
| CT | 612 | — |
| DC | 5.93 | — |
| DE | 782 | — |
| FL | 6,776 | — |
| GA | 0 | — |
| GLIFWC | 0 | — |
| GU | 0 | — |
| HI | 0 | — |
| IA | 0 | — |
| ID | 0 | — |
| IL | 0 | — |
| IN | 0 | — |

| State/Tribe | Response | Notes |
|-------------|----------|-------|
| KS | 0 | — |
| KY | 0 | — |
| LA | 0 | — |
| MA | 0 | — |
| MD | 2,353 | — |
| ME | 30 | — |
| ME ABM | 0 | — |
| MI | 0 | — |
| MN | 0 | — |
| MO | 0 | — |
| MS | 0 | — |
| MT | 0 | — |
| NC | 300 | — |
| ND | 0 | — |
| NE | 0 | — |
| NH | 0 | — |
| NJ | 100 | — |
| NM | 0 | — |
| NV | 0 | — |
| NY | Unknown | — |

| State/Tribe | Response | Notes |
|-------------|---|-------|
| NY SRMT | 0 | — |
| OH | 0 | — |
| OK | 0 | — |
| OR | 0 | — |
| PA | 25 | — |
| RI | 0 | — |
| SC | 0 | — |
| SD | 0 | — |
| SD CRST | 7 | — |
| TN | 0 | — |
| TX | 655 | — |
| UT | 0 | — |
| VA | 2,106 | — |
| VT | NA | — |
| WA | 0 | — |
| WI | This information would take too much of my time to compile. | — |
| WV | 0 | — |
| WY | 0 | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

11. How many miles of marine coastline (coastal waters) were assessed at least once during the past 3 years specifically for the fish advisory program? (Enter the number only.)

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----|----------------|---|
| Did not collect/Could not calculate | — | > 1,000 miles | 2 |
| 0 miles | 42 | Not applicable | 4 |
| 1–1,000 miles | 8 | | |

| State/Tribe | Response |
|-------------|--|
| AK | 7,700 |
| AL | 75 |
| AR | 0 |
| AZ | 0 |
| CA | 170 |
| CO | 0 |
| CT | 380 |
| DC | 0 |
| DE | 25 |
| FL | 8,600 |
| GA | 0 |
| GLIFWC | 0 |
| GU | N/A |
| HI | 0 |
| IA | 0 |
| ID | 0 |
| IL | 0 |
| IN | 41 if are counting the Lake Michigan Coastline (note: not applicable because not marine coastline) |

| State/Tribe | Response |
|-------------|----------|
| KS | 0 |
| KY | 0 |
| LA | 0 |
| MA | 0 |
| MD | 31 |
| ME | 20 |
| ME ABM | 0 |
| MI | 0 |
| MN | 0 |
| MO | 0 |
| MS | 0 |
| MT | 0 |
| NC | 0 |
| ND | 0 |
| NE | 0 |
| NH | 0 |
| NJ | 25 |
| NM | 0 |
| NV | 0 |

| State/Tribe | Response |
|-------------|----------|
| NY | 600 |
| NY SRMT | 0 |
| OH | 0 |
| OK | 0 |
| OR | 0 |
| PA | 0 |
| RI | 0 |
| SC | 0 |
| SD | 0 |
| SD CRST | 0 |
| TN | 0 |
| TX | 0 |
| UT | 0 |
| VA | 0 |
| VT | NA |
| WA | 0 |
| WI | NA |
| WV | 0 |
| WY | 0 |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

12. Does your state issue fish consumption advisories advising individuals to restrict fish consumption?

Yes 56

No 0

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| AK | Yes | — |
| AL | Yes | — |
| AR | Yes | — |
| AZ | Yes | — |
| CA | Yes | — |
| CO | Yes | — |
| CT | Yes | — |
| DC | Yes | — |
| DE | Yes | — |
| FL | Yes | — |
| GA | Yes | — |
| GLIFWC | Yes | — |
| GU | Yes | — |
| HI | Yes | — |
| IA | Yes | — |
| ID | Yes | — |
| IL | Yes | — |
| IN | Yes | — |
| KS | Yes | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| KY | Yes | — |
| LA | Yes | — |
| MA | Yes | — |
| MD | Yes | — |
| ME | Yes | — |
| ME ABM | Yes | — |
| MI | Yes | — |
| MN | Yes | — |
| MO | Yes | — |
| MS | Yes | — |
| MT | Yes | — |
| NC | Yes | — |
| ND | Yes | — |
| NE | Yes | — |
| NH | Yes | — |
| NJ | Yes | — |
| NM | Yes | — |
| NV | Yes | — |
| NY | Yes | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| NY SRMT | Yes | — |
| OH | Yes | — |
| OK | Yes | — |
| OR | Yes | — |
| PA | Yes | — |
| RI | Yes | — |
| SC | Yes | — |
| SD | Yes | — |
| SD CRST | Yes | — |
| TN | Yes | — |
| TX | Yes | — |
| UT | Yes | — |
| VA | Yes | — |
| VT | Yes | — |
| WA | Yes | — |
| WI | Yes | — |
| WV | Yes | — |
| WY | Yes | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

13. Does your state issue fish consumption advisories advising individuals not to consume any fish or any fish of a particular species from a particular waterbody?

Yes 53

No 3

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| AK | Yes | — |
| AL | Yes | — |
| AR | Yes | — |
| AZ | Yes | — |
| CA | Yes | — |
| CO | Yes | — |
| CT | Yes | — |
| DC | Yes | — |
| DE | Yes | — |
| FL | Yes | — |
| GA | Yes | — |
| GLIFWC | Yes | — |
| GU | Yes | — |
| HI | Yes | — |
| IA | Yes | — |
| ID | Yes | — |
| IL | Yes | — |
| IN | Yes | — |
| KS | Yes | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| KY | Yes | — |
| LA | Yes | — |
| MA | Yes | — |
| MD | Yes | — |
| ME | Yes | — |
| ME ABM | Yes | — |
| MI | Yes | — |
| MN | Yes | — |
| MO | Yes | — |
| MS | Yes | — |
| MT | Yes | — |
| NC | Yes | — |
| ND | — | No |
| NE | — | No |
| NH | Yes | — |
| NJ | Yes | — |
| NM | Yes | — |
| NV | Yes | — |
| NY | Yes | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| NY SRMT | Yes | — |
| OH | Yes | — |
| OK | Yes | — |
| OR | Yes | — |
| PA | Yes | — |
| RI | Yes | — |
| SC | Yes | — |
| SD | — | No |
| SD CRST | Yes | — |
| TN | Yes | — |
| TX | Yes | — |
| UT | Yes | — |
| VA | Yes | — |
| VT | Yes | — |
| WA | Yes | — |
| WI | Yes | — |
| WV | Yes | — |
| WY | Yes | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

14. Fish consumption advisories issued in your state pertain to the following. (Please check all that apply.)

| | | | |
|---|----|--|----|
| Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | 55 | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | 36 |
| Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15-20 inches) | 37 | Certain fish species purchased in stores or restaurants | 11 |
| Select trophic groups (e.g., game fish, bottom feeders, or panfish) | 18 | Others (please specify) | 7 |

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|--|--|---|--|---|-------------------------|--|------|
| AK | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | — | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | Certain fish species purchased in stores or restaurants | | | |
| AL | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | — | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | | Others (please specify) | portions of waterbodies found to contain violative species | |
| AR | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | Select trophic groups (e.g., game fish, bottom feeders, or panfish) | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | | | | — |
| AZ | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | Select trophic groups (e.g., game fish, bottom feeders, or panfish) | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | | | | — |
| CA | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | — | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | | | | — |

14. Fish consumption advisories issued in your state pertain to the following. (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|--|--|---|--|---|-------------------------|--|------|
| CO | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | — | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | | | | — |
| CT | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | — | Select trophic groups (e.g., game fish, bottom feeders, or panfish) | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | Certain fish species purchased in stores or restaurants | | | |
| DC | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| DE | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | — | — | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | | | | — |
| FL | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | — | — | Certain fish species purchased in stores or restaurants | | | |
| GA | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | — | — | — | Others (please specify) | In lakes, the recommendations are both size and species specific. In rivers, the recommendations are only species specific (i.e., not size specific) | |
| GLIFWC | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | — | — | — | — | — | — |

14. Fish consumption advisories issued in your state pertain to the following. (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|--|--|---|--|---|---|---------|------|
| GU | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | — | — | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | | | | — |
| HI | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | — | — | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | Others (please specify) | Entire species from waterbody with limited data. Where we have sufficient data, the advisory will list individual species | | |
| IA | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | — | Select trophic groups (e.g., game fish, bottom feeders, or panfish) | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | | | | — |
| ID | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | — | — | — | Certain fish species purchased in stores or restaurants | | | |
| IL | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | Select trophic groups (e.g., game fish, bottom feeders, or panfish) | — | — | — | — | — |
| IN | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | — | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | Certain fish species purchased in stores or restaurants | | | |
| KS | — | — | Select trophic groups (e.g., game fish, bottom feeders, or panfish) | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | | | | — |

14. Fish consumption advisories issued in your state pertain to the following. (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|--|--|---|--|---|---------|---------|------|
| KY | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | — | Select trophic groups (e.g., game fish, bottom feeders, or panfish) | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | | | | — |
| LA | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MA | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | — | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | Certain fish species purchased in stores or restaurants | | | |
| MD | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | Select trophic groups (e.g., game fish, bottom feeders, or panfish) | — | — | — | — | — |
| ME | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | — | — | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | | | | — |
| ME ABM | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | — | Select trophic groups (e.g., game fish, bottom feeders, or panfish) | — | Certain fish species purchased in stores or restaurants | | | |
| MI | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | — | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | | | | — |

14. Fish consumption advisories issued in your state pertain to the following. (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|--|--|---|--|---|-------------------------|--|------|
| MN | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | — | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | Certain fish species purchased in stores or restaurants | Others (please specify) | Statewide advice for all fish and all waterbodies as well as site-specific advice for tested waters | |
| MO | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | Select trophic groups (e.g., game fish, bottom feeders, or panfish) | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | | | All fish is from EPA's recommendation for sensitive populations to eat no more than 1 meal per week in areas not sampled due to mercury levels | |
| MS | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | Select trophic groups (e.g., game fish, bottom feeders, or panfish) | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | | | | — |
| MT | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | — | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | | | | — |
| NC | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| ND | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NE | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | — | Select trophic groups (e.g., game fish, bottom feeders, or panfish) | — | — | — | — | — |

14. Fish consumption advisories issued in your state pertain to the following. (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|--|--|---|--|---|---------|---------|------|
| NH | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | — | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | Certain fish species purchased in stores or restaurants | | | |
| NJ | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | — | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | | | | — |
| NM | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | — | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | | | | — |
| NV | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | — | — | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | | | | — |
| NY | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | — | — | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | | | | — |
| NY SRMT | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | Select trophic groups (e.g., game fish, bottom feeders, or panfish) | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | | | | — |
| OH | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | — | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | | | | — |

14. Fish consumption advisories issued in your state pertain to the following. (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|--|--|---|--|---|---------|--|------|
| OK | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | Select trophic groups (e.g., game fish, bottom feeders, or panfish) | — | — | — | — | — |
| OR | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | — | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | | | Several advisories are issued based on whether or not the fish is resident and excluded migratory fish such as salmon. | |
| PA | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | Select trophic groups (e.g., game fish, bottom feeders, or panfish) | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | | | | — |
| RI | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | — | — | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | | | | — |
| SC | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | — | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | Certain fish species purchased in stores or restaurants | | | |
| SD | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| SD CRST | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | Select trophic groups (e.g., game fish, bottom feeders, or panfish) | — | — | — | — | — |

14. Fish consumption advisories issued in your state pertain to the following. (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|--|--|---|--|---|-------------------------|--|------|
| TN | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | — | — | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | | Others (please specify) | Public advised to limit or avoid consumption of other animals such as turtles, fish, crayfish and mussels in waterbodies with a fishing advisory. | |
| TX | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | — | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | | | | — |
| UT | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| VA | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| VT | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | — | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | | | No updates issued in 2010 | |
| WA | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | Select trophic groups (e.g., game fish, bottom feeders, or panfish) | The entire fish community (e.g., all fish) | Certain fish species purchased in stores or restaurants | Others (please specify) | State wide mercury fish advisory for certain commercial fish (shark, swordfish, king mackerel, tilefish, large tuna, canned tuna) for women of childbearing age and children under six. Limit consumption of canned tuna based on a women's or child's weight. | |

14. Fish consumption advisories issued in your state pertain to the following. (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|--|--|---|-----|-----|-------------------------|---------------------------------|------|
| WI | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | — | — | — | Others (please specify) | statewide and location specific | |
| WV | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | Specified size class(es) for the given species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass 15–20 inches) | Select trophic groups (e.g., game fish, bottom feeders, or panfish) | — | — | — | — | — |
| WY | Specific fish species analyzed (e.g., largemouth bass) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

15. Does your state issue statewide or regionwide “blanket” advisories based on your sampling effort?

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|----|----------------------------------|----|
| Statewide yes | 34 | Regionwide yes | 16 |
| Statewide no | 21 | Regionwide no | 39 |
| Statewide not applicable | 1 | Regionwide not applicable | 1 |

| State/Tribe | Statewide_Y | Statewide_N | Statewide_NA | Regionwide_Y | Regionwide_N | Regionwide_NA |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| AK | Yes | — | — | Yes | — | — |
| AL | — | No | — | — | No | — |
| AR | — | No | — | — | No | — |
| AZ | — | No | — | — | No | — |
| CA | — | No | — | Yes | — | — |
| CO | — | No | — | — | No | — |
| CT | Yes | — | — | — | No | — |
| DC | Yes | — | — | — | No | — |
| DE | Yes | — | — | — | No | — |
| FL | Yes | — | — | Yes | — | — |
| GA | — | No | — | Yes | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | No | — | — | No | — |
| GU | — | No | — | — | No | — |
| HI | Yes | — | — | Yes | — | — |
| IA | Yes | — | — | — | No | — |
| ID | Yes | — | — | — | No | — |
| IL | Yes | — | — | — | No | — |
| IN | Yes | — | — | Yes | — | — |
| KS | Yes | — | — | — | No | — |
| KY | Yes | — | — | — | No | — |
| LA | — | No | — | — | No | — |
| MA | Yes | — | — | — | No | — |
| MD | Yes | — | — | Yes | — | — |

15. Does your state issue statewide or regionwide “blanket” advisories based on your sampling effort? (continued)

| State/Tribe | Statewide_Y | Statewide_N | Statewide_NA | Regionwide_Y | Regionwide_N | Regionwide_NA |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| ME | Yes | — | — | Yes | — | — |
| ME ABM | Yes | — | — | Yes | — | — |
| MI | Yes | — | — | — | No | — |
| MN | Yes | — | — | — | No | — |
| MO | Yes | — | — | — | No | — |
| MS | — | No | — | Yes | — | — |
| MT | — | No | — | — | No | — |
| NC | Yes | — | — | Yes | — | — |
| ND | Yes | — | — | — | No | — |
| NE | — | No | — | — | No | — |
| NH | Yes | — | — | — | No | — |
| NJ | Yes | — | — | Yes | — | — |
| NM | — | No | — | — | No | — |
| NV | — | No | — | — | No | — |
| NY | Yes | — | — | Yes | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | — | Not applicable | Yes | — | — |
| OH | Yes | — | — | — | No | — |
| OK | Yes | — | — | Yes | — | — |
| OR | — | No | — | — | No | — |
| PA | Yes | — | — | — | No | — |
| RI | Yes | — | — | — | No | — |
| SC | Yes | — | — | — | No | — |
| SD | — | No | — | — | No | — |
| SD CRST | Yes | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| TN | — | No | — | — | No | — |
| TX | — | No | — | — | No | — |
| UT | — | No | — | — | No | — |

15. Does your state issue statewide or regionwide “blanket” advisories based on your sampling effort? (continued)

| State/Tribe | Statewide_Y | Statewide_N | Statewide_NA | Regionwide_Y | Regionwide_N | Regionwide_NA |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| VA | — | No | — | — | No | — |
| VT | Yes | — | — | Yes | — | — |
| WA | Yes | — | — | — | No | — |
| WI | Yes | — | — | — | No | — |
| WV | Yes | — | — | — | No | — |
| WY | — | No | — | — | No | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

16. Do you have legally enforced advisories or bans within your state (e.g., are fines or citations given for fishing in posted waters)?

Yes 7

No 49

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| AK | — | No |
| AL | — | No |
| AR | — | No |
| AZ | — | No |
| CA | — | No |
| CO | — | No |
| CT | — | No |
| DC | — | No |
| DE | — | No |
| FL | — | No |
| GA | Yes | — |
| GLIFWC | — | No |
| GU | — | No |
| HI | — | No |
| IA | — | No |
| ID | — | No |
| IL | — | No |
| IN | — | No |
| KS | — | No |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| KY | — | No |
| LA | — | No |
| MA | — | No |
| MD | — | No |
| ME | — | No |
| ME ABM | — | No |
| MI | — | No |
| MN | — | No |
| MO | — | No |
| MS | — | No |
| MT | — | No |
| NC | — | No |
| ND | — | No |
| NE | — | No |
| NH | Yes | — |
| NJ | Yes | — |
| NM | Yes | — |
| NV | — | No |
| NY | Yes | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| NY SRMT | — | No |
| OH | — | No |
| OK | — | No |
| OR | — | No |
| PA | — | No |
| RI | — | No |
| SC | — | No |
| SD | — | No |
| SD CRST | — | No |
| TN | — | No |
| TX | Yes | — |
| UT | — | No |
| VA | — | No |
| VT | — | No |
| WA | — | No |
| WI | — | No |
| WV | — | No |
| WY | Yes | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

17. Does your state issue commercial fishing bans for chemically-contaminated fish or shellfish?

Yes 20

No 36

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| AK | Yes | — |
| AL | Yes | — |
| AR | Yes | — |
| AZ | — | No |
| CA | Yes | — |
| CO | — | No |
| CT | — | No |
| DC | Yes | — |
| DE | — | No |
| FL | — | No |
| GA | Yes | — |
| GLIFWC | — | No |
| GU | — | No |
| HI | — | No |
| IA | — | No |
| ID | — | No |
| IL | Yes | — |
| IN | — | No |
| KS | — | No |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| KY | Yes | — |
| LA | — | No |
| MA | Yes | — |
| MD | — | No |
| ME | — | No |
| ME ABM | — | No |
| MI | Yes | — |
| MN | — | No |
| MO | — | No |
| MS | Yes | — |
| MT | — | No |
| NC | Yes | — |
| ND | — | No |
| NE | — | No |
| NH | — | No |
| NJ | Yes | — |
| NM | — | No |
| NV | — | No |
| NY | Yes | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| NY SRMT | — | No |
| OH | — | No |
| OK | — | No |
| OR | Yes | — |
| PA | — | No |
| RI | Yes | — |
| SC | — | No |
| SD | — | No |
| SD CRST | — | No |
| TN | Yes | — |
| TX | Yes | — |
| UT | — | No |
| VA | Yes | — |
| VT | — | No |
| WA | — | No |
| WI | Yes | — |
| WV | — | No |
| WY | — | No |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

18. If your state or tribe has commercial fishing bans in a waterbody, do they include consumption information for sport and subsistence fishers?

Yes 17
No 1
Not applicable 38

| State/ Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|--------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| AK | Yes | — | — |
| AL | — | — | Not applicable |
| AR | Yes | — | — |
| AZ | — | — | Not applicable |
| CA | Yes | — | — |
| CO | — | — | Not applicable |
| CT | — | — | Not applicable |
| DC | — | — | Not applicable |
| DE | — | — | Not applicable |
| FL | — | — | Not applicable |
| GA | Yes | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | Not applicable |
| GU | — | — | Not applicable |
| HI | — | — | Not applicable |
| IA | — | — | Not applicable |
| ID | — | — | Not applicable |
| IL | — | No | — |
| IN | — | — | Not applicable |
| KS | — | — | Not applicable |
| KY | Yes | — | — |
| LA | — | — | Not applicable |
| MA | Yes | — | — |

| State/ Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|--------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| MD | — | — | Not applicable |
| ME | — | — | Not applicable |
| ME ABM | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | Yes | — | — |
| MN | — | — | Not applicable |
| MO | — | — | Not applicable |
| MS | Yes | — | — |
| MT | — | — | Not applicable |
| NC | Yes | — | — |
| ND | — | — | Not applicable |
| NE | — | — | Not applicable |
| NH | — | — | Not applicable |
| NJ | Yes | — | — |
| NM | — | — | Not applicable |
| NV | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY | Yes | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | — | Not applicable |
| OH | — | — | Not applicable |
| OK | — | — | Not applicable |
| OR | Yes | — | — |
| PA | — | — | Not applicable |
| RI | Yes | — | — |

| State/ Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|--------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| SC | — | — | Not applicable |
| SD | — | — | Not applicable |
| SD CRST | — | — | Not applicable |
| TN | Yes | — | — |
| TX | Yes | — | — |
| UT | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

| State/ Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|--------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| VA | Yes | — | — |
| VT | — | — | Not applicable |
| WA | — | — | Not applicable |
| WI | Yes | — | — |
| WV | — | — | Not applicable |
| WY | — | — | Not applicable |

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

19. In addition to chemical contaminants, does your state or tribe also issue fish and/or shellfish advisories (closures) for microbial contamination (e.g., bacteria or viruses)?

Yes 28
No 25
Not Applicable 3

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| AK | Yes | — | — |
| AL | Yes | — | — |
| AR | Yes | — | — |
| AZ | — | No | — |
| CA | Yes | — | — |
| CO | — | — | Not applicable |
| CT | Yes | — | — |
| DC | — | No | — |
| DE | Yes | — | — |
| FL | Yes | — | — |
| GA | Yes | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | No | — |
| GU | Yes | — | — |
| HI | Yes | — | — |
| IA | — | No | — |
| ID | — | No | — |
| IL | — | No | — |
| IN | — | No | — |
| KS | Yes | — | — |
| KY | — | No | — |
| LA | Yes | — | — |
| MA | Yes | — | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| MD | Yes | — | — |
| ME | Yes | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | No | — |
| MI | — | No | — |
| MN | — | No | — |
| MO | Yes | — | — |
| MS | Yes | — | — |
| MT | — | No | — |
| NC | Yes | — | — |
| ND | — | No | — |
| NE | — | No | — |
| NH | Yes | — | — |
| NJ | Yes | — | — |
| NM | — | No | — |
| NV | — | No | — |
| NY | Yes | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | No | — |
| OH | — | No | — |
| OK | — | No | — |
| OR | Yes | — | — |
| PA | — | — | Not applicable |
| RI | Yes | — | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| SC | Yes | — | — |
| SD | — | No | — |
| SD CRST | — | No | — |
| TN | — | No | — |
| TX | Yes | — | — |
| UT | — | No | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| VA | Yes | — | — |
| VT | — | No | — |
| WA | Yes | — | — |
| WI | — | — | Not applicable |
| WV | — | No | — |
| WY | Yes | — | — |

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

20. Fish consumption advisories (no consumption and/or restricted consumption advisories) issued in your state are based on the analysis of the following. (Please check all that apply.)

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----|--|----|
| Whole-fish samples (skin on) | 12 | Muscle plug samples | 11 |
| Whole-fish samples (skin off) | 4 | Other sample types (please specify) | 11 |
| Fillet samples (skin on) | 31 | Not applicable | 1 |
| Fillet samples (skin off) | 45 | | |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|------|
| AK | Whole-fish samples (skin on) | — | — | Fillet samples (skin off) | Muscle plug samples | Other sample types (please specify) | shucked shell fish | — |
| AL | — | — | — | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | Other sample types (please specify) | composites | — |
| AR | — | Whole-fish samples (skin off) | — | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | — | — |
| AZ | — | — | — | Fillet samples (skin off) | Muscle plug samples | | | — |
| CA | — | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | — | — |
| CO | — | — | — | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | — | — |
| CT | — | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | — | — | — | — | — |
| DC | — | — | — | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | — | — |
| DE | — | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | Fillet samples (skin off) | Muscle plug samples | | | — |
| FL | — | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | Fillet samples (skin off) | Muscle plug samples | | | — |
| GA | — | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | — | — |

20. Fish consumption advisories (no consumption and/or restricted consumption advisories) issued in your state are based on the analysis of the following. (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-----|-------------------------------------|---|------|
| GLIFWC | — | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | We use both because we share data with WI, MI and MN who collect skin on fillets. All GLIFWC data are from skin off fillets | |
| GU | Whole-fish samples (skin on) | Whole-fish samples (skin off) | Fillet samples (skin on) | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | — | — |
| HI | Whole-fish samples (skin on) | — | — | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | — | — |
| IA | — | — | — | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | — | — |
| ID | Whole-fish samples (skin on) | — | — | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | Other sample types (please specify) | composites | — |
| IL | — | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | Other sample types (please specify) | Headless & gutted for smelt | — |
| IN | — | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | — | — |
| KS | Whole-fish samples (skin on) | — | — | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | EPA has announced it's intention to stop supporting whole fish monitoring starting next year. | |
| KY | — | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | — | — |
| LA | — | — | — | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | — | — |
| MA | — | — | — | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | — | — |
| MD | — | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | — | — |
| ME | Whole-fish samples (skin on) | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | — | — | — | — | — |

20. Fish consumption advisories (no consumption and/or restricted consumption advisories) issued in your state are based on the analysis of the following. (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|-----|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|--|----------------|
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | — | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | Other sample types (please specify) | Skin-off steak (sturgeon), headless gutted (smelt) | |
| MN | — | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | — | — |
| MO | — | — | — | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | — | — |
| MS | — | — | — | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | — | — |
| MT | — | — | — | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | — | — |
| NC | — | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | — | — | — | — | — |
| ND | — | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | — | Muscle plug samples | | | — |
| NE | — | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | — | — | Other sample types (please specify) | catfish samples are processed with skin off | |
| NH | — | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | — | — |
| NJ | — | — | — | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | Other sample types (please specify) | Crab muscle and hepatopancreas tissues | |
| NM | — | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | Fillet samples (skin off) | Muscle plug samples | | | — |
| NV | Whole-fish samples (skin on) | — | — | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | — | — |
| NY | Whole-fish samples (skin on) | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | — | — |

20. Fish consumption advisories (no consumption and/or restricted consumption advisories) issued in your state are based on the analysis of the following. (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|---|------|
| NY SRMT | Whole-fish samples (skin on) | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | — | — | — | — | — |
| OH | — | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | — | — |
| OK | — | — | — | Fillet samples (skin off) | Muscle plug samples | Other sample types (please specify) | Carcass samples - headless skin-on eviscerated preparations with bones | — |
| OR | Whole-fish samples (skin on) | Whole-fish samples (skin off) | Fillet samples (skin on) | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | — | — |
| PA | — | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | Other sample types (please specify) | American eel sections (STORET = no head, viscera, or skin) | — |
| RI | Whole-fish samples (skin on) | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | — | — | — | — | — |
| SC | — | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | — | — | — | — | — |
| SD | — | — | — | Fillet samples (skin off) | Muscle plug samples | | Comparison has been done with plug samples and this may be the choice in the future. | — |
| SD CRST | — | — | — | Fillet samples (skin off) | Muscle plug samples | | | — |
| TN | — | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | Skin on (scaled) for gamefish, skin off for rough fish and catfish. | — |
| TX | — | — | — | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | — | — |
| UT | — | — | — | — | Muscle plug samples | | | — |
| VA | — | — | — | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | — | — |
| VT | — | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | Other sample types (please specify) | smelt are whole fish, we may on occasion also do muscle plug. No analyses were conducted in 2010. | — |

20. Fish consumption advisories (no consumption and/or restricted consumption advisories) issued in your state are based on the analysis of the following. (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|--|------|
| WA | Whole-fish samples (skin on) | Whole-fish samples (skin off) | Fillet samples (skin on) | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | — | — |
| WI | — | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | Other sample types (please specify) | Edible portion | — |
| WV | — | — | Fillet samples (skin on) | Fillet samples (skin off) | — | — | Fillets for scaled fish are skin-on, scaleless fish are skin-off | — |
| WY | — | — | — | — | Muscle plug samples | | | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

21. Does your state target the collection of particular indicator species, and on what is this decision based? (Please check all that apply.)

| | | | |
|--|----|--|----|
| Angler survey data | 19 | Citizen requests | 14 |
| Availability of the species | 45 | State does not target collection of indicator species | 9 |
| Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | 40 | Other reasons (please specify) | 12 |
| EPA target species recommendations based on bioaccumulation potential/trophic group | 26 | Not applicable | 1 |

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|------------------|-----|--------------------------------|--|------|
| AK | Angler survey data | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | | Citizen requests | | Other reasons (please specify) | Species that are commonly used for commercial and subsistence purposes | |
| AL | | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | | | | | | |
| AR | | Availability of the species | | EPA target species recommendations based on bioaccumulation potential/trophic group | Citizen requests | | | | |
| AZ | Angler survey data | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | EPA target species recommendations based on bioaccumulation potential/trophic group | | | | | |
| CA | Angler survey data | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | EPA target species recommendations based on bioaccumulation potential/trophic group | | | Other reasons (please specify) | Use a number of factors to select most appropriate indicator | |

21. Does your state target the collection of particular indicator species, and on what is this decision based? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|------------------|-----|--------------------------------|--|------|
| CO | | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | | | | | | |
| CT | | | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | | | | Other reasons (please specify) | Bioaccumulation potential | |
| DC | | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | EPA target species recommendations based on bioaccumulation potential/trophic group | | | | | |
| DE | Angler survey data | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | EPA target species recommendations based on bioaccumulation potential/trophic group | | | | | |
| FL | | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | EPA target species recommendations based on bioaccumulation potential/trophic group | | | Other reasons (please specify) | Research on using indicator species is ongoing | |
| GA | | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | EPA target species recommendations based on bioaccumulation potential/trophic group | Citizen requests | | | | |
| GLIFWC | | | | | | | Other reasons (please specify) | species chosen based on tribal harvest preference | |
| GU | Angler survey data | | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | | | | | | |
| HI | Angler survey data | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | | | | Other reasons (please specify) | Species which are likely to be the most contaminated | |

21. Does your state target the collection of particular indicator species, and on what is this decision based? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|------------------|---|---------|--------------------------|------|
| IA | | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | EPA target species recommendations based on bioaccumulation potential/trophic group | | | | | |
| ID | | Availability of the species | | | Citizen requests | | | | |
| IL | | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | | | | | | |
| IN | | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | | | | | Functional feeding guild | |
| KS | Angler survey data | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | EPA target species recommendations based on bioaccumulation potential/trophic group | | | | | |
| KY | | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | EPA target species recommendations based on bioaccumulation potential/trophic group | | | | | |
| LA | | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | | | State does not target collection of indicator species | | | |
| MA | | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | EPA target species recommendations based on bioaccumulation potential/trophic group | Citizen requests | | | | |

21. Does your state target the collection of particular indicator species, and on what is this decision based? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|------------------|-----|--------------------------------|---|------|
| MD | Angler survey data | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | EPA target species recommendations based on bioaccumulation potential/trophic group | Citizen requests | | Other reasons (please specify) | Data Gaps | |
| ME | | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | | Citizen requests | | | | |
| ME ABM | | Availability of the species | | EPA target species recommendations based on bioaccumulation potential/trophic group | Citizen requests | | | | |
| MI | Angler survey data | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | EPA target species recommendations based on bioaccumulation potential/trophic group | Citizen requests | | Other reasons (please specify) | Specific trophic groups | |
| MN | Angler survey data | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | | Citizen requests | | Other reasons (please specify) | Representative top predator and panfish | |
| MO | | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | | | | Other reasons (please specify) | Trophic level decision-making | |
| MS | | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | EPA target species recommendations based on bioaccumulation potential/trophic group | | | | | |

21. Does your state target the collection of particular indicator species, and on what is this decision based? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|------------------|---|---------|---------|------|
| MT | | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | | Citizen requests | State does not target collection of indicator species | | | |
| NC | | Availability of the species | | | | | | | |
| ND | | | | | | State does not target collection of indicator species | | | |
| NE | Angler survey data | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | EPA target species recommendations based on bioaccumulation potential/trophic group | | | | | |
| NH | Angler survey data | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | EPA target species recommendations based on bioaccumulation potential/trophic group | Citizen requests | | | | |
| NJ | | | | | | State does not target collection of indicator species | | | |
| NM | | | | | | State does not target collection of indicator species | | | |
| NV | Angler survey data | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | | | | | | |

21. Does your state target the collection of particular indicator species, and on what is this decision based? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|------------------|---|--------------------------------|---|----------------|
| NY | | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | | | | Other reasons (please specify) | state target species, pollution potential | |
| NY SRMT | | | | | | | | | Not applicable |
| OH | | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | | | | | | |
| OK | | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | EPA target species recommendations based on bioaccumulation potential/trophic group | | | | | |
| OR | Angler survey data | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | EPA target species recommendations based on bioaccumulation potential/trophic group | | | | | |
| PA | | | | | | State does not target collection of indicator species | | | |
| RI | | Availability of the species | | EPA target species recommendations based on bioaccumulation potential/trophic group | | | | | |
| SC | | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | EPA target species recommendations based on bioaccumulation potential/trophic group | | | | | |
| SD | | | | | | State does not target collection of indicator species | | | |
| SD CRST | Angler survey data | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | | Citizen requests | | | | |

21. Does your state target the collection of particular indicator species, and on what is this decision based? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|------|
| TN | | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | EPA target species recommendations based on bioaccumulation potential/trophic group | | | | | |
| TX | Angler survey data | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | EPA target species recommendations based on bioaccumulation potential/trophic group | | | | | |
| UT | | | | | | State does not target collection of indicator species | | | |
| VA | | Availability of the species | | | Citizen requests | | | Collects bottomfeeders and sportfish | |
| VT | | | | | | State does not target collection of indicator species | | We informally can look at Yellow Perch for mercury | |
| WA | Angler survey data | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | EPA target species recommendations based on bioaccumulation potential/trophic group | | | | | |
| WI | Angler survey data | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | | | | Other reasons (please specify) | Regulations for a specific waterbody | |
| WV | Angler survey data | Availability of the species | Desire to maintain consistency with past collections | EPA target species recommendations based on bioaccumulation potential/trophic group | | | | | |
| WY | | Availability of the species | | EPA target species recommendations based on bioaccumulation potential/trophic group | | | | Data on Hg levels | |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

22. Does your state collect multiple size classes by species and submit these individual size classes for residue analyses?

Yes 44
No 10
Not Applicable 2

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| AK | Yes | — | — |
| AL | — | No | — |
| AR | Yes | — | — |
| AZ | Yes | — | — |
| CA | — | No | — |
| CO | Yes | — | — |
| CT | Yes | — | — |
| DC | — | No | — |
| DE | Yes | — | — |
| FL | Yes | — | — |
| GA | Yes | — | — |
| GLIFWC | Yes | — | — |
| GU | — | — | Not applicable |
| HI | Yes | — | — |
| IA | — | No | — |
| ID | — | No | — |
| IL | Yes | — | — |
| IN | Yes | — | — |
| KS | Yes | — | — |
| KY | Yes | — | — |
| LA | Yes | — | — |
| MA | Yes | — | — |
| MD | Yes | — | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| ME | Yes | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | Yes | — | — |
| MN | Yes | — | — |
| MO | Yes | — | — |
| MS | Yes | — | — |
| MT | Yes | — | — |
| NC | Yes | — | — |
| ND | Yes | — | — |
| NE | — | No | — |
| NH | Yes | — | — |
| NJ | Yes | — | — |
| NM | Yes | — | — |
| NV | Yes | — | — |
| NY | Yes | — | — |
| NY SRMT | Yes | — | — |
| OH | Yes | — | — |
| OK | Yes | — | — |
| OR | Yes | — | — |
| PA | Yes | — | — |
| RI | Yes | — | — |
| SC | Yes | — | — |
| SD | Yes | — | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| SD CRST | Yes | — | — |
| TN | Yes | — | — |
| TX | — | No | — |
| UT | — | No | — |
| VA | — | No | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| VT | — | No | — |
| WA | Yes | — | — |
| WI | Yes | — | — |
| WV | Yes | — | — |
| WY | Yes | — | — |

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

23. Are individual fish samples or composite samples submitted for residue analyses in your state?

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----|---|----|
| Composite samples only | 10 | Both individual and composite samples are used | 39 |
| Individual fish samples only | 6 | Not applicable | 1 |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|------------------------|--|----------------|
| AK | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| AL | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| AR | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| AZ | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| CA | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| CO | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| CT | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| DC | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| DE | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| FL | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| GA | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| GLIFWC | Individual fish samples only | — | — | — |
| GU | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| HI | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| IA | — | Composite samples only | — | — |
| ID | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| IL | — | Composite samples only | — | — |
| IN | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| KS | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| KY | — | Composite samples only | — | — |
| LA | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| MA | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| MD | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| ME | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |

23. Are individual fish samples or composite samples submitted for residue analyses in your state? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|------------------------|--|------|
| ME ABM | Individual fish samples only | — | — | — |
| MI | Individual fish samples only | — | — | — |
| MN | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| MO | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| MS | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| MT | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| NC | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| ND | Individual fish samples only | — | — | — |
| NE | — | Composite samples only | — | — |
| NH | Individual fish samples only | — | — | — |
| NJ | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| NM | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| NV | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| NY | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| NY SRMT | Individual fish samples only | — | — | — |
| OH | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| OK | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| OR | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| PA | — | Composite samples only | — | — |
| RI | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| SC | Individual fish samples only | — | — | — |
| SD | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| SD CRST | Individual fish samples only | — | — | — |
| TN | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| TX | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| UT | Individual fish samples only | — | — | — |
| VA | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |

23. Are individual fish samples or composite samples submitted for residue analyses in your state? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|------------------------|--|------|
| VT | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| WA | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| WI | — | — | Both individual and composite samples are used | — |
| WV | — | Composite samples only | — | — |
| WY | Individual fish samples only | — | — | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

24. If individual fish samples are used, how many individual fish are needed to support an advisory determination in a waterbody?

| | | | |
|---------------------|----|---|----|
| 1 fish | 4 | 11 to 20 fish | 1 |
| 3 fish | 7 | > 20 fish | 1 |
| 5 fish | 10 | Other number (please specify) | 17 |
| 6 to 10 fish | 8 | Not applicable; state uses only composite fish samples | 8 |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|--------|--------|--------|--------------|-----|-----|-------------------------------|---|------|
| AK | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | Statistically significant portion of the fish samples collected for mercury advisories, for marine toxins one composite sample with detectable toxin will cause an advisory to be issued. | — |
| AL | — | — | — | 6 to 10 fish | — | — | — | — | — |
| AR | — | 3 fish | — | — | — | — | — | Prefer at least 3 samples of either individual or composite sets to support an advisory | — |
| AZ | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | Waterbody specific | — |
| CA | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | Varies with waterbody size | — |
| CO | 1 fish | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| CT | — | — | — | 6 to 10 fish | — | — | — | — | — |
| DC | 1 fish | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| DE | — | — | 5 fish | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| FL | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | 12 fish/freshwater species site for advisories, 12 marine fish/site. Limited or no consumption made with fewer fish | — |
| GA | — | — | 5 fish | — | — | — | — | — | — |

**24. If individual fish samples are used, how many individual fish are needed to support an advisory determination in a waterbody?
(continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----------------------------------|---|--|
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | 4 fish | — |
| GU | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | Currently GEPA errors on the side of protectiveness, any amount of fish sampled in a given area has elevated levels of chemicals we will recommend an advisory. | — |
| HI | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | 20 species for mercury study | — |
| IA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable; state uses only composite fish samples |
| ID | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | 10 or more although if the contaminant level is high enough we can issue a temporary advisory until it is feasible to collect 10 or more fish | — |
| IL | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable; state uses only composite fish samples |
| IN | 1 fish | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

**24. If individual fish samples are used, how many individual fish are needed to support an advisory determination in a waterbody?
(continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|--------|--------|--------------|-----|-----|-------------------------------|---|--|
| KS | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | We occasionally submit single fish samples, when that is all we can capture at a site, or if we capture a fish whose size class is not represented in the database. However, we do not issue advisories based on single fish samples. | Not applicable; state uses only composite fish samples |
| KY | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable; state uses only composite fish samples |
| LA | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | >15 PER SPECIES | — |
| MA | — | 3 fish | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MD | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | A minimum of 5 fish are needed to support an advisory. This can be a combination of composites or discrete samples. | — |
| ME | — | — | 5 fish | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable; state uses only composite fish samples |
| MI | — | — | — | 6 to 10 fish | — | — | — | — | — |
| MN | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | site-specific decision | — |

**24. If individual fish samples are used, how many individual fish are needed to support an advisory determination in a waterbody?
(continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|--------|--------|--------------|-----|-----------|-------------------------------|--|--|
| MO | — | 3 fish | — | — | — | — | — | We may issue an advisory with as few as 3 fish depending on the situation, but we would likely work with the agency that collected these fish and request additional sampling be done. | — |
| MS | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | Use a weight evidence approach and depends on the size of the waterbody, amount of data from nearby waters, usually in combination with multiple composite samples. | — |
| MT | — | — | 5 fish | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NC | — | — | 5 fish | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| ND | — | 3 fish | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NE | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable; state uses only composite fish samples |
| NH | — | — | — | 6 to 10 fish | — | — | — | Prefer to have at least 10 samples per species per waterbody to base a decision. | — |
| NJ | — | 3 fish | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NM | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | Not specified, but we try to have at least 5. | — |
| NV | — | — | — | 6 to 10 fish | — | — | — | — | — |
| NY | — | 3 fish | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | — | — | — | — | > 20 fish | — | — | — |

**24. If individual fish samples are used, how many individual fish are needed to support an advisory determination in a waterbody?
(continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|--------|--------|--------|--------------|---------------|-----|-------------------------------|--|--|
| OH | — | — | 5 fish | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| OK | — | — | 5 fish | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| OR | — | — | — | 6 to 10 fish | — | — | — | — | — |
| PA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable; state uses only composite fish samples |
| RI | — | 3 fish | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| SC | — | — | — | 6 to 10 fish | — | — | — | — | — |
| SD | — | — | — | 6 to 10 fish | — | — | — | — | — |
| SD CRST | 1 fish | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| TN | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | No set number | — |
| TX | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | Sample size is dependent upon water body size and available funding. (at least 10 fish) | — |
| UT | — | — | 5 fish | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| VA | — | — | — | — | 11 to 20 fish | — | — | — | — |
| VT | — | — | 5 fish | — | — | — | — | 5 is a rough guideline. No collections or analyses were conducted in 2010. | — |
| WA | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | Depends on the variability of contaminant concentration (if known). Sample size power tests conducted to determine number. | — |
| WI | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | Variable number, but always >1, past data/advisories may be considered | — |

**24. If individual fish samples are used, how many individual fish are needed to support an advisory determination in a waterbody?
(continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|-----|--------|-----|-----|-----|---------|---------|--|
| WV | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable; state uses only composite fish samples |
| WY | — | — | 5 fish | — | — | — | — | — | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

25. If composite samples are used, how many individual fish typically are combined in each of your state's composite samples for residue analysis?

| | | | |
|---------------|----|--|----|
| 3 fish | 4 | Other number (please specify) | 25 |
| 5 fish | 18 | Not applicable; state uses only individual fish samples | 9 |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|--------|-----|--------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| AK | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | composite samples used for shell fish routinely, 10 to 20 shellfish; fin fish generally analyzed as individual fish samples, but in cases of smaller fishes 10 to 30 individuals can make up a composite sample | |
| AL | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | as many as are available, @ least 6 | |
| AR | — | — | — | 5 fish | — | — | — |
| AZ | — | — | — | 5 fish | — | — | — |
| CA | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | Varies with waterbody size | |
| CO | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | Ranges from 2 to 10 per composite. | |
| CT | — | — | — | 5 fish | — | — | — |
| DC | — | 3 fish | — | — | — | — | — |
| DE | — | — | — | 5 fish | — | — | — |
| FL | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | 12 for fresh water/Composites rarely used for marine | |
| GA | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | Accept range of 3-5, 5 is best | |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable; state uses only individual fish samples |
| GU | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | We base our fish sample on the approximate weight required to conduct the lab analysis. | |
| HI | — | 3 fish | — | — | — | — | — |
| IA | — | — | — | 5 fish | — | — | — |

25. If composite samples are used, how many individual fish typically are combined in each of your state's composite samples for residue analysis? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|--------|-----|--------|-------------------------------|--|---|
| ID | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | 10 | — |
| IL | — | — | — | 5 fish | — | — | — |
| IN | — | — | — | 5 fish | — | — | — |
| KS | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | 3-6 typically, target 5 | |
| KY | — | — | — | 5 fish | — | — | — |
| LA | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | 3 to 5 | — |
| MA | — | 3 fish | — | — | — | — | — |
| MD | — | — | — | 5 fish | — | — | — |
| ME | — | — | — | 5 fish | — | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable; state uses only individual fish samples |
| MI | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | Variable with circumstances, from 2 to 10 | |
| MN | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | depends on collection | |
| MO | — | — | — | 5 fish | — | Present methodology is 3 composites of 5 fish. In the past it was 15-25 fish composite. Dept of Natural Resources composites 5 fish. | |
| MS | — | — | — | 5 fish | — | — | — |
| MT | — | — | — | 5 fish | — | — | — |
| NC | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | 5 or less | — |
| ND | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable; state uses only individual fish samples |
| NE | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | We require a sample to consist of 3 to 5 fish. | |

25. If composite samples are used, how many individual fish typically are combined in each of your state's composite samples for residue analysis? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|--------|-----|--------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| NH | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable; state uses only individual fish samples |
| NJ | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | 5 for fish, and 5-8 for blue crab | |
| NM | — | — | — | 5 fish | — | typically 5, but can vary from 2-12 | |
| NV | — | — | — | 5 fish | — | — | — |
| NY | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | depends on size and availability | |
| NY SRMT | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable; state uses only individual fish samples |
| OH | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | It varies, but usually 3-5 fish | |
| OK | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | 3 to 8 | — |
| OR | — | 3 fish | — | — | — | — | — |
| PA | — | — | — | 5 fish | — | — | — |
| RI | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | Varies with availability | |
| SC | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable; state uses only individual fish samples |
| SD | — | — | — | 5 fish | — | — | — |
| SD CRST | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable; state uses only individual fish samples |
| TN | — | — | — | 5 fish | — | May vary depending on availability of fish | |
| TX | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | Crab and oyster samples are the only species composited (approximately 200g muscle tissue; 3-5 samples) | |
| UT | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable; state uses only individual fish samples |

25. If composite samples are used, how many individual fish typically are combined in each of your state's composite samples for residue analysis? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------------------------|--|---|
| VA | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | varies on availability | |
| VT | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | number varies, no collections or analyses were conducted in 2010 | |
| WA | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | Depends on the nature of the contaminant, size of waterbody, size of fish, available funding. Sample size power tests conducted to determine number. | |
| WI | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | varies | — |
| WV | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | 5 is preferred, will accept as few as 3 | |
| WY | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable; state uses only individual fish samples |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

26. If composite samples are used, how many composite samples are needed to support an advisory determination in a waterbody?

| | | | |
|----------------------------|----|--|----|
| 1 composite sample | 14 | Variable; no set number used | 4 |
| 2 composite samples | 8 | Other number (please specify) | 14 |
| 3 composite samples | 6 | Not applicable; state uses only individual fish samples | 10 |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|--------------------|-----|---------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| AK | 1 composite sample | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| AL | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | 1 composite verified by re-analyzing the individual subs making up the composite | — |
| AR | — | — | 3 composite samples | — | — | Prefer at least 3 samples of either individual or composite sets to support an advisory | — |
| AZ | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | Waterbody specific | — |
| CA | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | Varies with waterbody size | — |
| CO | 1 composite sample | — | — | — | — | For mercury advisories, range from 1 to 5 size groups in exceedance of action level. | — |
| CT | — | — | 3 composite samples | — | — | — | — |
| DC | 1 composite sample | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| DE | — | — | — | Variable; no set number used | — | — | — |
| FL | 1 composite sample | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| GA | — | — | 3 composite samples | — | — | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable; state uses only individual fish samples |
| GU | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | — | — |

**26. If composite samples are used, how many composite samples are needed to support an advisory determination in a waterbody?
(continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|
| HI | — | — | 3 composite samples | — | — | — | — |
| IA | — | 2 composite samples | — | — | — | — | — |
| ID | 1 composite sample | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| IL | — | 2 composite samples | — | — | — | — | — |
| IN | 1 composite sample | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| KS | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | Minimum of 6 composite samples collected over 3 years. | |
| KY | — | 2 composite samples | — | — | — | — | — |
| LA | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | 5 to 10 | — |
| MA | 1 composite sample | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MD | 1 composite sample | — | — | — | — | (as long as there are at least 5 fish in the composite) Depends on size class, variability of data | |
| ME | — | 2 composite samples | — | — | — | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable; state uses only individual fish samples |
| MI | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable; state uses only individual fish samples |
| MN | — | — | — | Variable; no set number used | — | — | — |

**26. If composite samples are used, how many composite samples are needed to support an advisory determination in a waterbody?
(continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|--------------------|-----|---------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| MO | 1 composite sample | — | — | — | — | We may issue an advisory with as little as 1 composite sample depending on the situation, but we would likely work with the agency that collected these fish and request additional sampling be done. | |
| MS | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | No set number, depends on weight of evidence approach and depends on amount of additional data from similar waterbodies, but in all cases to date we have had at least 3 composite samples. | |
| MT | 1 composite sample | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NC | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | Site-specific | |
| ND | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable; state uses only individual fish samples |
| NE | 1 composite sample | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NH | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable; state uses only individual fish samples |
| NJ | — | — | — | Variable; no set number used | — | — | — |
| NM | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | Not specified, but we try to have at least 2 composites. | |
| NV | 1 composite sample | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NY | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | depends on data | |
| NY SRMT | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable; state uses only individual fish samples |
| OH | — | — | 3 composite samples | — | — | — | — |

**26. If composite samples are used, how many composite samples are needed to support an advisory determination in a waterbody?
(continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| OK | — | 2 composite samples | — | — | — | — | — |
| OR | — | 2 composite samples | — | — | — | — | — |
| PA | — | 2 composite samples | — | — | — | — | — |
| RI | 1 composite sample | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| SC | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable; state uses only individual fish samples |
| SD | 1 composite sample | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| SD CRST | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable; state uses only individual fish samples |
| TN | — | — | — | Variable; no set number used | — | — | — |
| TX | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | at least 10 | |
| UT | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable; state uses only individual fish samples |
| VA | — | — | 3 composite samples | — | — | — | — |
| VT | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | Whatever is available. No collections or analyses were conducted in 2010. | |
| WA | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | Depends on the nature of the contaminant, size of waterbody, size of fish | |
| WI | — | — | — | — | Other number (please specify) | Variable based on data and past data/advisories | |
| WV | — | 2 composite samples | — | — | — | — | — |

**26. If composite samples are used, how many composite samples are needed to support an advisory determination in a waterbody?
(continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------|---------|---|
| WY | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable; state uses only individual fish samples |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

27. Assuming your state finds residue levels in exceedance of state criteria, how many years of sampling are required at a given waterbody before a fish consumption advisory can be issued?

| | | | |
|------------------------|----|---|----|
| 1 year | 24 | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | 10 |
| 2 years | 3 | Other (please specify) | 15 |
| 3 or more years | 1 | Not applicable | 3 |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|--------|---------|-----|--|------------------------|---|------|
| AK | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | For marine toxins (PSP, Domoic Acid) immediate advisory is issued. For environmental contaminants in finfish there is no set time frame. When residue levels exceed state criteria, risk assessment is performed to determine if an advisory is required. | |
| AL | 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| AR | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | — | — |
| AZ | 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| CA | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Dependent on a number of factors | |
| CO | 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| CT | 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| DC | 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| DE | 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| FL | 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| GA | 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | posting new advisories is based on available funding | |
| GU | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Please refer to question 24. | |
| HI | 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| IA | — | 2 years | — | — | — | — | — |
| ID | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | — | — |

27. Assuming your state finds residue levels in exceedance of state criteria, how many years of sampling are required at a given waterbody before a fish consumption advisory can be issued? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|--------|---------|-----------------|--|------------------------|---|----------------|
| IN | 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| KS | — | — | 3 or more years | — | — | — | — |
| KY | — | 2 years | — | — | — | — | — |
| LA | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | — | — |
| MA | 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MD | 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| ME | 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MN | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | — | — |
| MO | 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MS | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | We require two samplings which often translates into two years, but can be accomplished much quicker if needed. | — |
| MT | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | have only done a single round of sampling | — |
| NC | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | same year of sampling | — |
| ND | 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NE | 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NH | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | — | — |
| NJ | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | No set criteria | — |

27. Assuming your state finds residue levels in exceedance of state criteria, how many years of sampling are required at a given waterbody before a fish consumption advisory can be issued? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|--------|-----|-----|--|------------------------|--|------|
| NM | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | — | — |
| NV | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Issued Immediately | |
| NY | 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | — | — |
| OH | 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| OK | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | 2 sampling events | |
| OR | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | — | — |
| PA | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | normally 2 yrs, but can issue immediately if a "Do Not Eat" advisory | |
| RI | 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| SC | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | We can issue advisories on one year's worth of data if contamination is high enough to be an eminent health threat but generally use at least 2-3 years to issue and remove advisories | |
| SD | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | After testing indicates contaminant levels exceed or have the potential to exceed state criteria, the waterbody is extensively resampled within the same year or the following sample year based on when results are received and the best time to collect the | |
| SD CRST | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | — | — |
| TN | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | No set number | |

27. Assuming your state finds residue levels in exceedance of state criteria, how many years of sampling are required at a given waterbody before a fish consumption advisory can be issued? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|--------|-----|-----|--|------------------------|---|----------------|
| TX | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | — | — |
| UT | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| VA | 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| VT | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Immediately. No collections or analyses were conducted in 2010. | |
| WA | 1 year | — | — | — | — | Depends on quality of data | |
| WI | 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| WV | 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| WY | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

28. If commercial fishing bans are issued in your state, on which of the following sample types are they based? (Please check all that apply.)

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|----|
| Whole-fish samples (skin-on) | 1 | Fillet samples (skin-off) | 14 |
| Whole-fish samples (skin-off) | 1 | Other sample types (please specify) | 4 |
| Fillet samples (skin-on) | 9 | Not applicable | 38 |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|----------------|
| AK | — | — | — | — | Other sample types (please specify) | We have issued only commercial advisories, not bans. We do not have the authority to close waters to commercial fishing. Only the Dept. of Fish and Game may do that. We have however not allowed the processing of fish from contaminated waters during a pollution event, such as the Exxon Valdez oil spill. The DEC may prohibit a commercial shell fish farmer from selling product to the public. | |
| AL | — | — | — | Fillet samples (skin-off) | — | based on fish consumption advisories issued | |
| AR | — | Whole-fish samples (skin-off) | — | Fillet samples (skin-off) | — | — | — |
| AZ | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| CA | — | — | — | Fillet samples (skin-off) | — | — | — |
| CO | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| CT | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| DC | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| DE | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| FL | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| GA | — | — | Fillet samples (skin-on) | Fillet samples (skin-off) | — | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| GU | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

28. If commercial fishing bans are issued in your state, on which of the following sample types are they based? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|-----|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|----------------|
| HI | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IA | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ID | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IL | — | — | Fillet samples (skin-on) | Fillet samples (skin-off) | — | — | — |
| IN | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| KS | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| KY | — | — | Fillet samples (skin-on) | Fillet samples (skin-off) | — | — | — |
| LA | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MA | — | — | — | — | Other sample types (please specify) | Lobster meat and tomalley analyzed together | |
| MD | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ME | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | — | — | Fillet samples (skin-on) | Fillet samples (skin-off) | — | Determined by MI Dept of Agriculture | |
| MN | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MO | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MS | — | — | — | Fillet samples (skin-off) | — | — | — |
| MT | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NC | — | — | Fillet samples (skin-on) | — | — | — | — |
| ND | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NE | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NH | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

28. If commercial fishing bans are issued in your state, on which of the following sample types are they based? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|-----|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| NJ | — | — | — | Fillet samples (skin-off) | Other sample types (please specify) | hepatopancreas tissue of crabs | |
| NM | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NV | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY | — | — | Fillet samples (skin-on) | Fillet samples (skin-off) | — | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OH | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OK | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OR | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| PA | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| RI | Whole-fish samples (skin-on) | — | Fillet samples (skin-on) | — | — | — | — |
| SC | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| SD | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| SD CRST | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| TN | — | — | Fillet samples (skin-on) | Fillet samples (skin-off) | — | — | — |
| TX | — | — | — | Fillet samples (skin-off) | — | — | — |
| UT | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| VA | — | — | — | Fillet samples (skin-off) | — | — | — |
| VT | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WA | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WI | — | — | Fillet samples (skin-on) | Fillet samples (skin-off) | Other sample types (please specify) | edible portions | |

28. If commercial fishing bans are issued in your state, on which of the following sample types are they based? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------|---------|----------------|
| WV | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WY | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

29. How many fish tissue samples must be analyzed and found to be in exceedance of state criteria before a commercial fishing ban is issued?

| | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|----|
| 1 sample | 1 | Site-specific decision; no set number established | 7 |
| 2 samples | 1 | Not applicable | 39 |
| 3 or more samples | 8 | | |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_NA |
|-------------|----------|-----------|-------------------|---|----------------|
| AK | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set number established | — |
| AL | 1 sample | — | — | — | — |
| AR | — | — | 3 or more samples | — | — |
| AZ | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| CA | — | — | 3 or more samples | — | — |
| CO | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| CT | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| DC | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| DE | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| FL | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| GA | — | — | 3 or more samples | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| GU | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| HI | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IA | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ID | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IL | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IN | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| KS | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| KY | — | 2 samples | — | — | — |
| LA | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MA | — | — | 3 or more samples | — | — |

29. How many fish tissue samples must be analyzed and found to be in exceedance of state criteria before a commercial fishing ban is issued? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|-----|-------------------|---|----------------|
| MD | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ME | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set number established | — |
| MN | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MO | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MS | — | — | 3 or more samples | — | — |
| MT | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NC | — | — | 3 or more samples | — | — |
| ND | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NE | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NH | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NJ | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set number established | — |
| NM | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NV | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY | — | — | 3 or more samples | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OH | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OK | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OR | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| PA | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| RI | — | — | 3 or more samples | — | — |
| SC | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| SD | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| SD CRST | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set number established | — |
| TN | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set number established | — |

29. How many fish tissue samples must be analyzed and found to be in exceedance of state criteria before a commercial fishing ban is issued? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|-----|-----|---|----------------|
| TX | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| UT | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| VA | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set number established | — |
| VT | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WA | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WI | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set number established | — |
| WV | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WY | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

30. How many years of sampling are conducted at a given waterbody before a commercial fishing ban can be issued?

| | | | |
|----------------|---|--|----|
| 1 year | 7 | Site-specific decision; no set number established | 5 |
| 2 years | 4 | Not applicable | 40 |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_NA |
|-------------|--------|---------|-----|-----|----------------|
| AK | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| AL | 1 year | — | — | — | — |
| AR | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| AZ | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| CA | — | 2 years | — | — | — |
| CO | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| CT | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| DC | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| DE | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| FL | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| GA | 1 year | — | — | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| GU | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| HI | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IA | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ID | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IL | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IN | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| KS | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| KY | — | 2 years | — | — | — |
| LA | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MA | — | 2 years | — | — | — |
| MD | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ME | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

30. How many years of sampling are conducted at a given waterbody before a commercial fishing ban can be issued? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_NA |
|-------------|--------|---------|-----|---|----------------|
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set number established | — |
| MN | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MO | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MS | — | 2 years | — | — | — |
| MT | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NC | 1 year | — | — | — | — |
| ND | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NE | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NH | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NJ | 1 year | — | — | — | — |
| NM | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NV | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY | 1 year | — | — | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set number established | — |
| OH | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OK | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OR | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| PA | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| RI | 1 year | — | — | — | — |
| SC | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| SD | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| SD CRST | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| TN | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set number established | — |
| TX | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set number established | — |
| UT | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

30. How many years of sampling are conducted at a given waterbody before a commercial fishing ban can be issued? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_NA |
|-------------|--------|-----|-----|---|----------------|
| VA | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set number established | — |
| VT | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WA | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WI | 1 year | — | — | — | — |
| WV | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WY | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

31. Once an advisory is issued for a specific waterbody, what must occur for the state to rescind the advisory?

| | |
|---|----|
| Residue levels of the chemical must decline below the state criterion for at least 1 year | 7 |
| Residue levels of the chemical must decline below the state criterion for at least 2 years | 12 |
| Residue levels of the pollutant must decline below the state criterion for at least 3 years | 2 |
| Site-specific decision; no set time period established | 18 |
| Other schedule or procedure (please specify) | 14 |
| Not applicable | 3 |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---|--|-----|--|--|--|------|
| AK | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | Adequate sample numbers must be collected and shown to be below the established exceedence concentration and a risk assessment must be performed prior to rescinding any advisory. | — |
| AL | — | Residue levels of the chemical must decline below the state criterion for at least 2 years | — | — | — | — | — |
| AR | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | — | — |
| AZ | Residue levels of the chemical must decline below the state criterion for at least 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| CA | — | — | — | — | Other schedule or procedure (please specify) | Not specifically determined | — |

31. Once an advisory is issued for a specific waterbody, what must occur for the state to rescind the advisory? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---|-----|-----|--|--|---|----------------|
| CO | — | — | — | — | Other schedule or procedure (please specify) | The policies addressing all aspects of Fish Consumption Advisories are being reviewed and will be updated in the near future. | — |
| CT | — | — | — | — | Other schedule or procedure (please specify) | variable | — |
| DC | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| DE | — | — | — | — | Other schedule or procedure (please specify) | 2 consecutive surveys showing sufficient reduction | — |
| FL | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | — | — |
| GA | — | — | — | — | Other schedule or procedure (please specify) | In general, at least one year of data below concern levels. However, there are no set requirements. This is really a case by case decision. | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | — | — |
| GU | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | — | — |
| HI | Residue levels of the chemical must decline below the state criterion for at least 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |

31. Once an advisory is issued for a specific waterbody, what must occur for the state to rescind the advisory? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---|--|---|--|---------|---|----------------|
| IA | — | Residue levels of the chemical must decline below the state criterion for at least 2 years | — | — | — | Need two consecutive samplings below advisory trigger to rescind. | — |
| ID | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | — | — |
| IL | — | Residue levels of the chemical must decline below the state criterion for at least 2 years | — | — | — | — | — |
| IN | Residue levels of the chemical must decline below the state criterion for at least 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| KS | — | — | Residue levels of the pollutant must decline below the state criterion for at least 3 years | — | — | — | — |
| KY | — | Residue levels of the chemical must decline below the state criterion for at least 2 years | — | — | — | — | — |
| LA | — | Residue levels of the chemical must decline below the state criterion for at least 2 years | — | — | — | — | — |
| MA | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

31. Once an advisory is issued for a specific waterbody, what must occur for the state to rescind the advisory? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|--|-----|--|--|---|------|
| MD | — | — | — | — | Other schedule or procedure (please specify) | Change in risk assessment assumptions, or residue levels decline below state criteria for 1 year (OC compounds); for mercury use a confidence interval approach if levels are below state guidelines. | — |
| ME | — | Residue levels of the chemical must decline below the state criterion for at least 2 years | — | — | — | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | — | — |
| MI | — | Residue levels of the chemical must decline below the state criterion for at least 2 years | — | — | — | 2 dataset from different years both showing similar reductions | — |
| MN | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | — | — |

31. Once an advisory is issued for a specific waterbody, what must occur for the state to rescind the advisory? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---|--|-----|--|--|---|------|
| MO | — | — | — | — | Other schedule or procedure (please specify) | It depends on how the history of samples in the waterbody and the category of the advisory. If the advisory was based on 1 year of limited data, it would only require 1 year of substantial fish tissue sampling to remove the advisory. If the waterbody or | — |
| MS | — | Residue levels of the chemical must decline below the state criterion for at least 2 years | — | — | — | — | — |
| MT | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | — | — |
| NC | — | Residue levels of the chemical must decline below the state criterion for at least 2 years | — | — | — | — | — |
| ND | Residue levels of the chemical must decline below the state criterion for at least 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NE | Residue levels of the chemical must decline below the state criterion for at least 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |

31. Once an advisory is issued for a specific waterbody, what must occur for the state to rescind the advisory? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---|--|-----|--|--|---|------|
| NH | — | Residue levels of the chemical must decline below the state criterion for at least 2 years | — | — | — | — | — |
| NJ | — | — | — | — | Other schedule or procedure (please specify) | No set time criteria has been established to rescind an advisory | — |
| NM | — | — | — | — | Other schedule or procedure (please specify) | We have not yet established a protocol for rescinding a consumption advisory. | — |
| NV | Residue levels of the chemical must decline below the state criterion for at least 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NY | — | — | — | — | Other schedule or procedure (please specify) | depends on available data and source conditions | — |
| NY SRMT | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | — | — |
| OH | — | — | — | — | Other schedule or procedure (please specify) | Residue levels of the chemical must decline below the state criterion for two successive samplings. | — |
| OK | — | — | — | — | Other schedule or procedure (please specify) | Residue levels must decline below state criteria for at least 3 consecutive sampling events. | — |

31. Once an advisory is issued for a specific waterbody, what must occur for the state to rescind the advisory? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---|--|---|--|--|---|------|
| OR | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | — | — |
| PA | — | Residue levels of the chemical must decline below the state criterion for at least 2 years | — | — | — | — | — |
| RI | Residue levels of the chemical must decline below the state criterion for at least 1 year | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| SC | — | — | — | — | Other schedule or procedure (please specify) | Generally we average 2-3 years of data to rescind an advisory | — |
| SD | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | — | — |
| SD CRST | — | — | Residue levels of the pollutant must decline below the state criterion for at least 3 years | — | — | — | — |
| TN | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | — | — |
| TX | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | Residue levels of chemical must decline below state criterion | — |
| UT | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | — | — |

31. Once an advisory is issued for a specific waterbody, what must occur for the state to rescind the advisory? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|--|-----|--|--|---|----------------|
| VA | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | — | — |
| VT | — | — | — | — | Other schedule or procedure (please specify) | Decisions are made on a case by case basis. No collections or analyses or advisory revisions in 2010. | — |
| WA | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | — | — |
| WI | — | Residue levels of the chemical must decline below the state criterion for at least 2 years | — | — | — | — | — |
| WV | — | — | — | Site-specific decision; no set time period established | — | — | — |
| WY | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

32. During this past year, please estimate the number of fish tissue samples that were submitted for chemical analyses by your state agency?

| | | | |
|-----------------------|----|---|----|
| 0 samples | 12 | 41–50 samples | 0 |
| <20 samples | 3 | 51–60 samples | 5 |
| 21–30 samples | 1 | >60 samples (please specify number) | 32 |
| 31–40 samples | 2 | Not applicable | 1 |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | Specify |
|-------------|-----------|-------------|-----|---------------|-----|-----|---|----------------|
| AK | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | > 400 samples |
| AL | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | 242 |
| AR | — | <20 samples | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| AZ | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | 100+-- |
| CA | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | 250 |
| CO | — | — | — | 31–40 samples | — | — | — | — |
| CT | 0 samples | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| DC | — | — | — | 31–40 samples | — | — | — | — |
| DE | 0 samples | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| FL | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | 2551 |
| GA | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | about 80 to 90 |

32. During this past year, please estimate the number of fish tissue samples that were submitted for chemical analyses by your state agency? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | Specify |
|-------------|-----------|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | 118 |
| GU | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | GEPA has provided oversight on US Navy fish advisory sites as well as a US Coast Guard fish advisory site. |
| HI | 0 samples | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| IA | — | — | — | — | — | — | 51–60 samples | — |
| ID | 0 samples | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| IL | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | 400 |
| IN | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | 72 |
| KS | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | 75 |
| KY | — | <20 samples | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| LA | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | 1021 |
| MA | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | 687 |
| MD | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | 64 |

32. During this past year, please estimate the number of fish tissue samples that were submitted for chemical analyses by your state agency? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | Specify |
|-------------|-----------|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|
| ME | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | 200 |
| ME ABM | 0 samples | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MI | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | 566 samples for 2010 |
| MN | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | 1200 |
| MO | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | 209 |
| MS | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | 210 |
| MT | — | — | — | — | — | — | 51–60 samples | — |
| NC | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | 350 |
| ND | 0 samples | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NE | — | — | — | — | — | — | 51–60 samples | — |
| NH | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | unsure of exact number |
| NJ | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | 400+ |
| NM | — | <20 samples | — | — | — | — | — | 13 samples assembled from 41 individual fish |

32. During this past year, please estimate the number of fish tissue samples that were submitted for chemical analyses by your state agency? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | Specify |
|-------------|-----------|-----|---------------|-----|-----|-----|--|--|
| NV | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | — |
| NY | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | 1500 to 3000 |
| NY SRMT | 0 samples | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| OH | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | 415 |
| OK | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | 80 |
| OR | 0 samples | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| PA | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | 142 |
| RI | 0 samples | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| SC | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | 900 |
| SD | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | about 75 |
| SD CRST | 0 samples | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| TN | — | — | 21–30 samples | — | — | — | — | Other samples collected and analyzed by TVA, DOE used by state |

32. During this past year, please estimate the number of fish tissue samples that were submitted for chemical analyses by your state agency? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | Specify |
|-------------|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|
| TX | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | 633 |
| UT | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | 286 |
| VA | 0 samples | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| VT | 0 samples | — | — | — | — | — | — | No collections or analyses in 2010. |
| WA | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | ~3000 |
| WI | — | — | — | — | — | — | >60 samples (please specify number) | 626 in calendar year 2009, 575 in calendar year 2010 |
| WV | — | — | — | — | — | — | 51–60 samples | — |
| WY | — | — | — | — | — | — | 51–60 samples | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

35. If your state analyzes for PCBs, what specifically is analyzed? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|--|---------|--|----------------|
| TN | — | — | Selected Aroclor groups | — | — | 1221, 1232, 1016-1242, 1248, 1254, 1260, 1262 | — |
| TX | Individual congeners | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| UT | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| VA | — | — | — | A combination of both Aroclors and congeners | — | — | — |
| VT | — | — | — | — | — | We don't have a regular analytical program for organics. If PCBs are done at all could come in as Aroclors or congeners. No collections or analyses in 2010. | Not applicable |
| WA | Individual congeners | All Aroclor groups | Selected Aroclor groups | A combination of both Aroclors and congeners | — | — | — |
| WI | — | — | Selected Aroclor groups | A combination of both Aroclors and congeners | — | — | — |
| WV | — | — | — | A combination of both Aroclors and congeners | — | — | — |
| WY | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

36. How many dollars are spent annually in your state on routine fish tissue field collection activities?

| | | | |
|----------------------|---|----------------------------|----|
| <\$1,000 | 4 | \$25,000 to \$50,000 | 11 |
| \$1,000 to \$4,999 | 4 | >\$50,000 (please specify) | 14 |
| \$5,000 to \$9,999 | 5 | Not applicable | 10 |
| \$10,000 to \$24,999 | 8 | | |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|-----|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--|----------------|
| AK | — | — | — | — | \$25,000 to \$50,000 | — | — | — |
| AL | — | — | — | — | \$25,000 to \$50,000 | — | — | — |
| AR | — | — | \$5,000 to \$9,999 | — | — | — | — | — |
| AZ | — | — | — | \$10,000 to \$24,999 | — | — | — | — |
| CA | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | \$200,000 | — |
| CO | — | — | — | \$10,000 to \$24,999 | — | — | — | — |
| CT | — | — | — | — | — | — | Variable | Not applicable |
| DC | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| DE | — | — | \$5,000 to \$9,999 | — | — | — | — | — |
| FL | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | 250000 | — |
| GA | — | — | — | — | \$25,000 to \$50,000 | — | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | \$25,000 to \$50,000 | — | — | — |
| GU | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| HI | — | — | — | \$10,000 to \$24,999 | — | — | — | — |
| IA | — | — | — | \$10,000 to \$24,999 | — | — | — | — |
| ID | — | — | — | — | — | — | no funding is available from state general funds so no sampling is being carried out | Not applicable |
| IL | — | — | — | — | \$25,000 to \$50,000 | — | — | — |

36. How many dollars are spent annually in your state on routine fish tissue field collection activities? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|----------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--|----------------|
| IN | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | Approx. \$150,000 | — |
| KS | — | — | \$5,000 to \$9,999 | — | — | — | — | — |
| KY | — | — | — | \$10,000 to \$24,999 | — | — | — | — |
| LA | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | — | — |
| MA | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | 70,000 | — |
| MD | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | Based on salaries for fish collection, management of data and calculating meal limits, lab cost etc. | — |
| ME | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | 75,000 | — |
| ME ABM | <\$1,000 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MI | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | unknown but greater than \$50K | — |
| MN | — | — | — | — | — | — | no specific funding for fish collections, DNR collects fish during population assessments | Not applicable |
| MO | — | — | — | — | \$25,000 to \$50,000 | — | — | — |
| MS | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | \$50-\$75 K | — |
| MT | — | \$1,000 to \$4,999 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NC | — | — | — | — | \$25,000 to \$50,000 | — | — | — |
| ND | — | — | \$5,000 to \$9,999 | — | — | — | — | — |
| NE | — | — | — | \$10,000 to \$24,999 | — | — | — | — |
| NH | — | \$1,000 to \$4,999 | — | — | — | — | — | — |

36. How many dollars are spent annually in your state on routine fish tissue field collection activities? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|----------|--------------------|-----|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--|----------------|
| NJ | — | — | — | — | — | — | No dedicated funding | Not applicable |
| NM | — | \$1,000 to \$4,999 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NV | — | — | — | \$10,000 to \$24,999 | — | — | — | — |
| NY | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | 100,000 to 500,000 | — |
| NY SRMT | — | — | — | \$10,000 to \$24,999 | — | — | — | — |
| OH | — | — | — | — | \$25,000 to \$50,000 | — | — | — |
| OK | — | — | — | — | \$25,000 to \$50,000 | — | — | — |
| OR | — | — | — | — | \$25,000 to \$50,000 | — | work done by Oregon DEQ | — |
| PA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| RI | <\$1,000 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| SC | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | 80,000 | — |
| SD | — | — | — | — | \$25,000 to \$50,000 | — | \$25000 annually on laboratory testing, another \$10,000 on manpower and equipment | — |
| SD CRST | <\$1,000 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| TN | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | No set amount | — |
| TX | — | — | — | — | — | — | Highly variable dependent upon EPA grants | Not applicable |
| UT | <\$1,000 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| VA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| VT | — | — | — | — | — | — | No collections or analyses conducted in 2010. | Not applicable |

36. How many dollars are spent annually in your state on routine fish tissue field collection activities? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|--------------------|--------------------|-----|-----|----------------------------|--|------|
| WA | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | Unknown - collection done by many different agencies | — |
| WI | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | not quantifiable | — |
| WV | — | — | \$5,000 to \$9,999 | — | — | — | — | — |
| WY | — | \$1,000 to \$4,999 | — | — | — | — | — | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

37. What was the funding source for your state's fish tissue collection activities during the past year? (Please check all that apply)

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----|-------------------------------|----|
| State general funds | 32 | EPA Region funds | 4 |
| State fishing license revenues | 11 | EPA Grant funds | 7 |
| State sales tax | 1 | Other (please specify) | 29 |
| EPA Section 106 funds | 18 | Not applicable | 3 |
| EPA Section 205j funds | 2 | | |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---------------------|-----|-----|-----------------------|-----|-----|-----|------------------------|----------------------------|------|
| AK | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Federal Grants, NOAA funds | — |
| AL | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| AR | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| AZ | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| CA | — | — | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| CO | State general funds | — | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | — | — |
| CT | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| DC | — | — | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| DE | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

**37. What was the funding source for your state's fish tissue collection activities during the past year? (Please check all that apply)
(continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|-----|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------------|---|----------------|
| FL | State general funds | State fishing license revenues | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | State environmental trust funds; Everglades Restoration Funds | — |
| GA | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | — | — | EPA Grant funds | Other (please specify) | BIA funds | — |
| GU | — | — | — | — | — | EPA Region funds | — | — | — | — |
| HI | — | — | — | EPA Section 106 funds | EPA Section 205j funds | — | EPA Grant funds | Other (please specify) | State special fund | — |
| IA | — | State fishing license revenues | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| ID | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | no funding was available | Not applicable |
| IL | State general funds | State fishing license revenues | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| IN | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | State funds | — |
| KS | State general funds | State fishing license revenues | — | — | — | EPA Region funds | — | Other (please specify) | KANSAS water plan fund | — |
| KY | — | — | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| LA | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | State Environmental Trust Fund | — |
| MA | State general funds | — | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | EPA Grant funds | — | — | — |

**37. What was the funding source for your state's fish tissue collection activities during the past year? (Please check all that apply)
(continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|-----|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------|-----|------------------------|--|------|
| MD | State general funds | — | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| ME | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | State | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Volunteer Labor | — |
| MI | State general funds | State fishing license revenues | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | State environmental bond money | — |
| MN | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Fish collected by another agency for population assessment | — |
| MO | — | State fishing license revenues | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | State Department of Conservation budget, specific sales tax, license sales | — |
| MS | State general funds | — | — | — | EPA Section 205j funds | — | — | — | — | — |
| MT | — | State fishing license revenues | — | — | — | EPA Region funds | — | Other (please specify) | All state fish and game agencies receives federal excise tax money from USFWS that can be used. You might add this to your list. | — |
| NC | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | State Division of Water Quality funds | — |

**37. What was the funding source for your state's fish tissue collection activities during the past year? (Please check all that apply)
(continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|-----|-----------------------|-----|-----|-----------------|------------------------|--|------|
| ND | State general funds | — | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NE | State general funds | — | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NH | — | — | — | — | — | — | EPA Grant funds | — | Federal funds from Performance Partnership Grant | — |
| NJ | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | State Funding Accounts: Site Remediation Program Funds, Multi-media Accounts | — |
| NM | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NV | — | State fishing license revenues | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Federal Sport Fishing Restoration Grant | — |
| NY | State general funds | State fishing license revenues | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | consent orders, grants, and co-op agreements | — |
| NY SRMT | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Tribal General Funds, DOI/BIA | — |
| OH | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | State 5bc fund (agency tipping fees) | — |
| OK | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Air Toxics | — |

**37. What was the funding source for your state's fish tissue collection activities during the past year? (Please check all that apply)
(continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---------------------|-----|-----------------|-----------------------|-----|-----|-----------------|------------------------|---|----------------|
| OR | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Oregon Lottery, work by Oregon DEQ | — |
| PA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | No specific funding source | — |
| RI | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Limited state funding, cooperate with other projects from Univ. of RI and EPA for additional data | — |
| SC | State general funds | — | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| SD | State general funds | — | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | — | — | EPA and state funds | — |
| SD CRST | — | — | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| TN | State general funds | — | State sales tax | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | EPA Grant funds | Other (please specify) | EPA, state appropriations, fees, TVA appropriations | — |
| TX | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | EPA Grant funds | Other (please specify) | EPA grant funds through the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality | — |
| UT | State general funds | — | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | EPA Grant funds | Other (please specify) | ATSDR | — |
| VA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| VT | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

**37. What was the funding source for your state's fish tissue collection activities during the past year? (Please check all that apply)
(continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|-----|-----------------------|-----|------------------|-----|------------------------|--|------|
| WA | State general funds | — | — | — | — | EPA Region funds | — | Other (please specify) | Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) - a tax on hazardous materials, collection done by many different agencies | — |
| WI | State general funds | State fishing license revenues | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | SFR/SEG-funded field work being conducted for purposes | — |
| WV | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| WY | — | State fishing license revenues | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

38. How many dollars are spent annually in your state on laboratory analyses of fish tissue samples?

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|----|
| <\$1,000 | 6 | \$25,000 to \$50,000 | 5 |
| \$1,000 to \$4,999 | 2 | >\$50,000 (please specify) | 22 |
| \$5,000 to \$9,999 | 3 | Not applicable | 9 |
| \$10,000 to \$24,999 | 9 | | |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|-----|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|---|----------------|
| AK | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | >140,000: contract laboratory for analysis. Laboratory analysis at state lab (supplies, and personnel services for chemist and technician). Contract for data validation. | — |
| AL | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | — | — |
| AR | — | — | \$5,000 to \$9,999 | — | — | — | — | — |
| AZ | — | — | — | \$10,000 to \$24,999 | — | — | — | — |
| CA | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | \$250,000 | — |
| CO | — | — | — | \$10,000 to \$24,999 | — | — | — | — |
| CT | — | — | — | — | — | — | Variable | Not applicable |
| DC | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| DE | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | — | — |
| FL | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | 60,000 - 65,000 may increase depending on amount of PCB activity. | — |
| GA | — | — | — | — | \$25,000 to \$50,000 | — | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | \$10,000 to \$24,999 | — | — | — | — |
| GU | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| HI | — | — | \$5,000 to \$9,999 | — | — | — | — | — |

38. How many dollars are spent annually in your state on laboratory analyses of fish tissue samples?

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|----------|--------------------|-----|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|---|----------------|
| IA | — | — | — | — | — | — | Analysis performed at no cost to state by EPA Region 7 lab. | Not applicable |
| ID | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IL | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | Approximately \$250,000 | — |
| IN | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | approximately \$175,000 | — |
| KS | — | — | — | — | — | — | Analyses performed by USEPA Region 7 Laboratory | Not applicable |
| KY | — | — | — | \$10,000 to \$24,999 | — | — | — | — |
| LA | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | — | — |
| MA | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | 81,000 | — |
| MD | — | — | — | — | \$25,000 to \$50,000 | — | — | — |
| ME | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | \$250,000 | — |
| ME ABM | <\$1,000 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MI | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | \$400K in 2010 analytical work | — |
| MN | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | 75,000 | — |
| MO | — | — | — | — | \$25,000 to \$50,000 | — | — | — |
| MS | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | \$50-75K | — |
| MT | — | \$1,000 to \$4,999 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NC | — | — | — | \$10,000 to \$24,999 | — | — | — | — |
| ND | — | — | — | \$10,000 to \$24,999 | — | — | — | — |

38. How many dollars are spent annually in your state on laboratory analyses of fish tissue samples?

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|----------|-----|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--|----------------|
| NE | <\$1,000 | — | — | — | — | — | PA Region 7 provides complete funding for all lab analyses | — |
| NH | — | — | — | \$10,000 to \$24,999 | — | — | — | — |
| NJ | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | \$250,000 | — |
| NM | — | — | — | \$10,000 to \$24,999 | — | — | — | — |
| NV | <\$1,000 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NY | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | >1 million | — |
| NY SRMT | — | — | \$5,000 to \$9,999 | — | — | — | — | — |
| OH | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | \$212,310 | — |
| OK | — | — | — | — | \$25,000 to \$50,000 | — | — | — |
| OR | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | \$80,000 by Oregon DEQ | — |
| PA | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | approx. \$100,000 budgeted | — |
| RI | <\$1,000 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| SC | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | Approx. \$500,000 | — |
| SD | — | — | — | — | \$25,000 to \$50,000 | — | about \$25,000 | — |
| SD CRST | <\$1,000 | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| TN | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | No set amount | — |
| TX | — | — | — | — | — | — | The amount spent annually is variable dependent upon funding | Not applicable |
| UT | <\$1,000 | — | — | — | — | — | EPA support | — |
| VA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

38. How many dollars are spent annually in your state on laboratory analyses of fish tissue samples?

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|--------------------|-----|----------------------|-----|-------------------------------|---|----------------|
| VT | — | — | — | — | — | — | No collections or analyses in 2010, on average \$1,000–\$4,999 reasonable estimate. | Not applicable |
| WA | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | Unknown amount due to multiple agency effort | — |
| WI | — | — | — | — | — | >\$50,000 (please specify) | amount varies depending on availability of funds but ranges \$100,000 to \$130,000 | — |
| WV | — | — | — | \$10,000 to \$24,999 | — | — | — | — |
| WY | — | \$1,000 to \$4,999 | — | — | — | — | — | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

39. What was the funding source for your state's laboratory analyses of fish tissue samples during this past year? (Please check all that apply)

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----|-------------------------------|----|
| State general funds | 29 | EPA Regional funds | 5 |
| State fishing license revenues | 4 | EPA Grant funds | 6 |
| State sales tax | 1 | Other (please specify) | 26 |
| EPA Section 106 funds | 13 | Not applicable | 7 |
| EPA Section 205j funds | 1 | | |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---------------------|-----|-----|-----------------------|-----|-----|-----------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|------|
| AK | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Federal Grants, NOAA Funds | — |
| AL | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| AR | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| AZ | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| CA | — | — | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| CO | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| CT | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | general state funds | — |
| DC | — | — | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| DE | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| FL | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | State environmental trust funds | — |
| GA | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | EPA Grant funds | — | — | — |

39. What was the funding source for your state's laboratory analyses of fish tissue samples during this past year? (Please check all that apply) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---------------------|-----|-----|-----------------------|-----|--------------------|-----|------------------------|---|----------------|
| GU | — | — | — | — | — | EPA Regional funds | — | — | — | — |
| HI | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | EPA Region 7 analyzes samples at no cost to the state | — |
| ID | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IL | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| IN | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | state funds | — |
| KS | State general funds | — | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | EPA Regional funds | — | Other (please specify) | Kansas Water Plan Funds | — |
| KY | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| LA | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MA | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MD | State general funds | — | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| ME | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | State, private industry (for dioxin) | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Tribal College (Environmental Laboratory) | — |
| MI | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | State environmental bond money | — |

39. What was the funding source for your state's laboratory analyses of fish tissue samples during this past year? (Please check all that apply) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|-----|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------------|--|----------------|
| MN | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MO | — | — | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | EPA Regional funds | — | Other (please specify) | State Dept. of Conservation budget | — |
| MS | State general funds | — | — | — | EPA Section 205j funds | — | EPA Grant funds | — | — | — |
| MT | — | State fishing license revenues | — | — | — | EPA Regional funds | — | — | — | — |
| NC | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | State Division of Water Quality funds | — |
| ND | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NE | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | EPA Region 7 provides complete funding for all lab analyses | — |
| NH | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Preventative Health Block Grant (federal funds) | — |
| NJ | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | State Funding Accounts: Site Remediation Program Funds, Multi-media Accounts | — |
| NM | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NV | — | State fishing license revenues | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Sport Fish Restoration Grant | — |

39. What was the funding source for your state's laboratory analyses of fish tissue samples during this past year? (Please check all that apply) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----|-----|-----------------|------------------------|---|----------------|
| NY | State general funds | State fishing license revenues | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | consent orders, grants, and co-op agreements | — |
| NY SRMT | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OH | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Ohio Fund 5BC (State Solid Waste Fund) | — |
| OK | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Air Toxics | — |
| OR | State general funds | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Oregon Lottery, ARRA | — |
| PA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | general state funds - PA Clean Water Fund | — |
| RI | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| SC | State general funds | — | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| SD | — | — | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | — | — | EPA | — |
| SD CRST | — | — | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| TN | State general funds | — | State sales tax | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | EPA Grant funds | Other (please specify) | EPA, state appropriations, fees, TVA appropriations | — |
| TX | State general funds | — | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | EPA Grant funds | Other (please specify) | EPA grant funds through the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality | — |

39. What was the funding source for your state's laboratory analyses of fish tissue samples during this past year? (Please check all that apply) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|-----|-----------------------|-----|--------------------|-----------------|------------------------|--|----------------|
| UT | State general funds | — | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | EPA Grant funds | Other (please specify) | ATSDR | — |
| VA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| VT | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WA | State general funds | — | — | — | — | EPA Regional funds | — | Other (please specify) | various sources: general funds, local agencies | — |
| WI | State general funds | — | — | EPA Section 106 funds | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| WV | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Stimulus Grant | — |
| WY | — | State fishing license revenues | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

40. If no funding is currently available, is your state seeking funding to conduct a monitoring and assessment program?

Yes 17
No 6
Not Applicable 33

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| AK | Yes | — | — |
| AL | — | No | — |
| AR | — | — | Not applicable |
| AZ | Yes | — | — |
| CA | — | — | Not applicable |
| CO | — | No | — |
| CT | — | — | Not applicable |
| DC | Yes | — | — |
| DE | Yes | — | — |
| FL | Yes | — | — |
| GA | — | — | Not applicable |
| GLIFWC | — | — | Not applicable |
| GU | Yes | — | — |
| HI | — | — | Not applicable |
| IA | — | — | Not applicable |
| ID | Yes | — | — |
| IL | — | — | Not applicable |
| IN | — | — | Not applicable |
| KS | — | — | Not applicable |
| KY | — | — | Not applicable |
| LA | — | — | Not applicable |
| MA | — | — | Not applicable |
| MD | — | — | Not applicable |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| ME | — | — | Not applicable |
| ME ABM | Yes | — | — |
| MI | — | — | Not applicable |
| MN | — | — | Not applicable |
| MO | — | — | Not applicable |
| MS | — | — | Not applicable |
| MT | — | No | — |
| NC | Yes | — | — |
| ND | — | — | Not applicable |
| NE | — | — | Not applicable |
| NH | Yes | — | — |
| NJ | — | — | Not applicable |
| NM | — | — | Not applicable |
| NV | — | No | — |
| NY | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY SRMT | Yes | — | — |
| OH | — | — | Not applicable |
| OK | — | — | Not applicable |
| OR | Yes | — | — |
| PA | — | — | Not applicable |
| RI | Yes | — | — |
| SC | — | — | Not applicable |
| SD | — | — | Not applicable |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| SD CRST | Yes | — | — |
| TN | — | — | Not applicable |
| TX | Yes | — | — |
| UT | Yes | — | — |
| VA | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| VT | — | No | — |
| WA | — | — | Not applicable |
| WI | — | — | Not applicable |
| WV | Yes | — | — |
| WY | — | No | — |

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

41. For your state's biennial 305(b) water quality report, what use support designation is assigned to waterbodies placed under fish consumption advisory?

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|----|---------------------------------|----|
| Fully supporting | 5 | Not supporting | 30 |
| Threatened | 2 | No assessments were made | 3 |
| Partially supporting | 15 | Not applicable | 8 |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|-----|----------------------|----------------|-----|----------------|
| AK | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| AL | — | — | Partially supporting | — | — | — |
| AR | — | — | Partially supporting | — | — | — |
| AZ | — | — | — | Not supporting | — | — |
| CA | — | — | — | Not supporting | — | — |
| CO | — | — | — | Not supporting | — | — |
| CT | — | — | Partially supporting | — | — | — |
| DC | — | — | — | Not supporting | — | — |
| DE | — | — | — | Not supporting | — | — |
| FL | — | — | Partially supporting | — | — | — |
| GA | — | — | Partially supporting | — | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| GU | — | — | — | Not supporting | — | — |
| HI | — | — | — | Not supporting | — | — |
| IA | — | — | Partially supporting | — | — | — |
| ID | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IL | — | — | Partially supporting | — | — | — |
| IN | — | — | Partially supporting | — | — | — |
| KS | — | — | — | Not supporting | — | — |
| KY | — | — | Partially supporting | Not supporting | — | — |
| LA | — | — | — | Not supporting | — | — |
| MA | — | — | — | Not supporting | — | — |

41. For your state's biennial 305(b) water quality report, what use support designation is assigned to waterbodies placed under fish consumption advisory? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------|------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| MD | — | — | Partially supporting | — | — | — |
| ME | — | — | Partially supporting | — | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | No assessments were made | — |
| MI | — | — | — | Not supporting | — | — |
| MN | Fully supporting | — | Partially supporting | Not supporting | — | — |
| MO | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MS | — | — | — | Not supporting | — | — |
| MT | — | — | — | — | No assessments were made | — |
| NC | — | — | — | Not supporting | — | — |
| ND | — | — | — | Not supporting | — | — |
| NE | — | — | — | Not supporting | — | — |
| NH | — | — | Partially supporting | — | — | — |
| NJ | Fully supporting | — | — | — | — | — |
| NM | — | — | — | Not supporting | — | — |
| NV | — | — | — | — | No assessments were made | — |
| NY | — | — | — | Not supporting | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | — | — | Not supporting | — | — |
| OH | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OK | — | — | — | Not supporting | — | — |
| OR | — | — | — | Not supporting | — | — |
| PA | — | — | — | Not supporting | — | — |
| RI | — | — | — | Not supporting | — | — |
| SC | — | — | — | Not supporting | — | — |
| SD | — | — | — | Not supporting | — | — |
| SD CRST | — | Threatened | — | — | — | — |
| TN | — | — | — | Not supporting | — | — |

41. For your state's biennial 305(b) water quality report, what use support designation is assigned to waterbodies placed under fish consumption advisory? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------|------------|----------------------|----------------|-----|----------------|
| TX | — | — | — | Not supporting | — | — |
| UT | Fully supporting | — | — | Not supporting | — | — |
| VA | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| VT | — | — | Partially supporting | — | — | — |
| WA | Fully supporting | — | — | — | — | — |
| WI | Fully supporting | Threatened | Partially supporting | Not supporting | — | — |
| WV | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WY | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

42. If fish consumption advisories have been issued for waterbodies in your state, does your state place these waterbodies on the state's 303(d) list of impaired waters?

Yes 40
No 9
Not applicable 7

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| AK | — | — | Not applicable |
| AL | Yes | — | — |
| AR | — | No | — |
| AZ | Yes | — | — |
| CA | Yes | — | — |
| CO | Yes | — | — |
| CT | Yes | — | — |
| DC | — | No | — |
| DE | Yes | — | — |
| FL | Yes | — | — |
| GA | — | No | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | Not applicable |
| GU | Yes | — | — |
| HI | Yes | — | — |
| IA | Yes | — | — |
| ID | — | No | — |
| IL | Yes | — | — |
| IN | Yes | — | — |
| KS | Yes | — | — |
| KY | Yes | — | — |
| LA | Yes | — | — |
| MA | Yes | — | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| MD | Yes | — | — |
| ME | Yes | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | Yes | — | — |
| MN | — | — | Not applicable |
| MO | — | No | — |
| MS | Yes | — | — |
| MT | — | No | — |
| NC | Yes | — | — |
| ND | Yes | — | — |
| NE | Yes | — | — |
| NH | Yes | — | — |
| NJ | Yes | — | — |
| NM | Yes | — | — |
| NV | Yes | — | — |
| NY | Yes | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | No | — |
| OH | — | — | Not applicable |
| OK | Yes | — | — |
| OR | Yes | — | — |
| PA | Yes | — | — |
| RI | Yes | — | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| SC | Yes | — | — |
| SD | Yes | — | — |
| SD CRST | — | — | Not applicable |
| TN | Yes | — | — |
| TX | Yes | — | — |
| UT | Yes | — | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| VA | — | No | — |
| VT | — | No | — |
| WA | Yes | — | — |
| WI | Yes | — | — |
| WV | Yes | — | — |
| WY | — | — | Not applicable |

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

43. If commercial fishing bans have been issued for waterbodies in your state, does your state place these waterbodies on the state's 303(d) list of impaired waters?

Yes 10
No 4
Not applicable 42

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| AK | — | — | Not applicable |
| AL | — | — | Not applicable |
| AR | — | No | — |
| AZ | — | — | Not applicable |
| CA | Yes | — | — |
| CO | — | — | Not applicable |
| CT | — | — | Not applicable |
| DC | — | — | Not applicable |
| DE | — | — | Not applicable |
| FL | — | — | Not applicable |
| GA | Yes | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | Not applicable |
| GU | — | — | Not applicable |
| HI | — | — | Not applicable |
| IA | — | — | Not applicable |
| ID | — | — | Not applicable |
| IL | — | — | Not applicable |
| IN | — | — | Not applicable |
| KS | — | — | Not applicable |
| KY | — | No | — |
| LA | — | — | Not applicable |
| MA | Yes | — | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| MD | — | — | Not applicable |
| ME | — | — | Not applicable |
| ME ABM | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | — | — | Not applicable |
| MN | — | — | Not applicable |
| MO | — | — | Not applicable |
| MS | Yes | — | — |
| MT | — | — | Not applicable |
| NC | Yes | — | — |
| ND | — | — | Not applicable |
| NE | — | — | Not applicable |
| NH | — | — | Not applicable |
| NJ | Yes | — | — |
| NM | — | — | Not applicable |
| NV | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY | Yes | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | No | — |
| OH | — | — | Not applicable |
| OK | — | — | Not applicable |
| OR | — | — | Not applicable |
| PA | — | — | Not applicable |
| RI | — | — | Not applicable |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| SC | — | — | Not applicable |
| SD | — | — | Not applicable |
| SD CRST | — | — | Not applicable |
| TN | Yes | — | — |
| TX | Yes | — | — |
| UT | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| VA | — | No | — |
| VT | — | — | Not applicable |
| WA | — | — | Not applicable |
| WI | Yes | — | — |
| WV | — | — | Not applicable |
| WY | — | — | Not applicable |

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

44. Is "fish consumption" an assigned beneficial use for waters in your state?**Yes** 36**No** 20

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| AK | Yes | — |
| AL | — | No |
| AR | — | No |
| AZ | Yes | — |
| CA | Yes | — |
| CO | — | No |
| CT | Yes | — |
| DC | Yes | — |
| DE | — | No |
| FL | Yes | — |
| GA | Yes | — |
| GLIFWC | — | No |
| GU | Yes | — |
| HI | Yes | — |
| IA | Yes | — |
| ID | — | No |
| IL | Yes | — |
| IN | — | No |
| KS | Yes | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| KY | Yes | — |
| LA | Yes | — |
| MA | Yes | — |
| MD | Yes | — |
| ME | Yes | — |
| ME ABM | Yes | — |
| MI | Yes | — |
| MN | Yes | — |
| MO | Yes | — |
| MS | — | No |
| MT | — | No |
| NC | Yes | — |
| ND | — | No |
| NE | — | No |
| NH | Yes | — |
| NJ | Yes | — |
| NM | — | No |
| NV | — | No |
| NY | — | No |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| NY SRMT | Yes | — |
| OH | — | No |
| OK | Yes | — |
| OR | Yes | — |
| PA | Yes | — |
| RI | Yes | — |
| SC | Yes | — |
| SD | — | No |
| SD CRST | Yes | — |
| TN | — | No |
| TX | Yes | — |
| UT | — | No |
| VA | Yes | — |
| VT | — | No |
| WA | Yes | — |
| WI | Yes | — |
| WV | Yes | — |
| WY | — | No |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

45. If yes, where have these criteria for beneficial use been established?

| | | | |
|--|----|-------------------------------|----|
| State water quality standards | 27 | Other (please specify) | 6 |
| SOP for assessing beneficial uses (or related document) | 2 | Not applicable | 21 |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-------------------------------|-----|------------------------|--|----------------|
| AK | State water quality standards | — | — | — | — |
| AL | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| AR | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| AZ | State water quality standards | — | — | — | — |
| CA | State water quality standards | — | — | — | — |
| CO | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| CT | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| DC | State water quality standards | — | — | — | — |
| DE | — | — | — | Listing Rationale for DE CWA Section 303(d) list | Not applicable |
| FL | State water quality standards | — | — | — | — |
| GA | State water quality standards | — | — | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| GU | State water quality standards | — | — | — | — |
| HI | State water quality standards | — | — | — | — |
| IA | State water quality standards | — | — | — | — |
| ID | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IL | — | — | Other (please specify) | Guidelines for 305(b) assessment procedures | — |
| IN | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| KS | State water quality standards | — | — | — | — |
| KY | State water quality standards | — | — | — | — |
| LA | State water quality standards | — | — | — | — |
| MA | State water quality standards | — | — | — | — |
| MD | State water quality standards | — | — | — | — |

45. If yes, where have these criteria for beneficial use been established? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-------------------------------|---|------------------------|--|----------------|
| ME | — | — | Other (please specify) | Policy unwritten, statutes say waters must be fishable | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | Other (please specify) | Tribal-EPA Agreement (TEA) | — |
| MI | State water quality standards | — | — | — | — |
| MN | State water quality standards | — | — | — | — |
| MO | State water quality standards | — | — | — | — |
| MS | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MT | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NC | — | SOP for assessing beneficial uses (or related document) | — | — | — |
| ND | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NE | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NH | State water quality standards | — | — | — | — |
| NJ | State water quality standards | — | — | — | — |
| NM | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NV | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY SRMT | State water quality standards | — | — | — | — |
| OH | — | — | — | The same data are used to issue fish consumption advisories and to list waters with 303d and 305b impairments, but different methodologies are used. | Not applicable |
| OK | — | — | Other (please specify) | State Continuing Planning Process | — |
| OR | State water quality standards | — | — | — | — |
| PA | State water quality standards | — | — | specific advisory criteria established in Fish Consumption Advisory Protocols | — |
| RI | — | SOP for assessing beneficial uses (or related document) | — | — | — |
| SC | State water quality standards | — | — | — | — |

45. If yes, where have these criteria for beneficial use been established? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-------------------------------|-----|------------------------|---|----------------|
| SD | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| SD CRST | — | — | Other (please specify) | EPA | — |
| TN | — | — | — | Fall under recreation use in the water quality standards | Not applicable |
| TX | State water quality standards | — | — | — | — |
| UT | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| VA | State water quality standards | — | — | — | — |
| VT | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WA | State water quality standards | — | — | — | — |
| WI | State water quality standards | — | — | — | — |
| WV | — | — | Other (please specify) | Addressed indirectly under WV Water Quality Regulations Category "C" recreational Contact (as Fishing). | — |
| WY | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

46. What method(s) does your state currently use to calculate “carcinogenic” health risks and to issue advisories for individuals who consume fish harvested from your state waters? (Please specify all current methods used.)

| | | | |
|---|----|--|---|
| Risk assessment methodology | 43 | Other approach (please specify) | 7 |
| Food and Drug Administration (FDA) action levels | 13 | Not applicable | 5 |
| None | 3 | | |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----------------------------|--|------|---------------------------------|--|----------------|
| AK | Risk assessment methodology | Food and Drug Administration (FDA) action levels | — | — | — | — |
| AL | Risk assessment methodology | Food and Drug Administration (FDA) action levels | — | Other approach (please specify) | Both FDA & EPA - transitioning from FDA to EPA | — |
| AR | Risk assessment methodology | Food and Drug Administration (FDA) action levels | — | — | — | — |
| AZ | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| CA | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| CO | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| CT | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| DC | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| DE | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| FL | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| GA | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| GU | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| HI | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| IA | — | Food and Drug Administration (FDA) action levels | — | — | — | — |
| ID | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IL | — | — | None | — | — | — |
| IN | Risk assessment methodology | Food and Drug Administration (FDA) action levels | — | — | — | — |

46. What method(s) does your state currently use to calculate “carcinogenic” health risks and to issue advisories for individuals who consume fish harvested from your state waters? (Please specify all current methods used.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----------------------------|---|------|------------------------------------|---|----------------|
| KS | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| KY | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| LA | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | Other approach (please specify) | RISK MANAGEMENT IN COMBINATION WITH RISK ASSESSMENT | — |
| MA | Risk assessment methodology | Food and Drug Administration (FDA) action levels | — | — | — | — |
| MD | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | Other approach (please specify) | Use of Maryland's Technical Support Document | — |
| ME | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | — | Food and Drug Administration (FDA) action levels | — | Other approach (please specify) | Great Lakes Fish Consumption Advisory Consortium levels | — |
| MN | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| MO | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| MS | Risk assessment methodology | Food and Drug Administration (FDA) action levels | — | — | — | — |
| MT | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| NC | — | — | — | Other approach (please specify) | Follow EPA guidance in recommended meals per month | — |
| ND | — | — | None | Other approach (please specify) | The state has not issued an advisory based on carcinogenic effects, only for mercury. | — |
| NE | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| NH | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| NJ | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| NM | — | — | — | Other approach (please specify) | EPA Guidance | — |
| NV | — | — | None | — | — | — |

46. What method(s) does your state currently use to calculate “carcinogenic” health risks and to issue advisories for individuals who consume fish harvested from your state waters? (Please specify all current methods used.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----------------------------|--|-----|---------|---|----------------|
| NY | Risk assessment methodology | Food and Drug Administration (FDA) action levels | — | — | — | — |
| NY SRMT | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| OH | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OK | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| OR | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| PA | Risk assessment methodology | Food and Drug Administration (FDA) action levels | — | — | — | — |
| RI | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| SC | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| SD | — | Food and Drug Administration (FDA) action levels | — | — | — | — |
| SD CRST | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| TN | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| TX | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| UT | Risk assessment methodology | Food and Drug Administration (FDA) action levels | — | — | — | — |
| VA | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| VT | Risk assessment methodology | Food and Drug Administration (FDA) action levels | — | — | No collections, analyses, assessments or advisory updates in 2010 | — |
| WA | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| WI | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| WV | Risk assessment methodology | — | — | — | — | — |
| WY | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

47. What carcinogenic risk level (i.e., individual risk within an exposed population) does your state use to issue advisories and/or post waterbodies?

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----|-------------------------------|----|
| 1:10,000 (10⁻⁴) | 11 | FDA action level | 7 |
| 1:100,000 (10⁻⁵) | 15 | Other (please specify) | 6 |
| 1:1,000,000(10⁻⁶) | 5 | Not applicable | 12 |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|------------------------|--|----------------|
| AK | — | 1:100,000 (10 ⁻⁵) | — | — | — | — | — |
| AL | — | — | — | FDA action level | — | — | — |
| AR | — | — | — | FDA action level | — | — | — |
| AZ | — | — | 1:1,000,000(10 ⁻⁶) | — | — | — | — |
| CA | 1:10,000 (10 ⁻⁴) | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| CO | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| CT | 1:10,000 (10 ⁻⁴) | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| DC | — | 1:100,000 (10 ⁻⁵) | — | — | — | — | — |
| DE | — | 1:100,000 (10 ⁻⁵) | — | — | — | — | — |
| FL | — | 1:100,000 (10 ⁻⁵) | — | — | — | — | — |
| GA | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | tiered system, > 10 ⁻⁴ = do not eat, > 10 ⁻⁵ = some restriction (i.e., 1 meal/week or month) | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| GU | 1:10,000 (10 ⁻⁴) | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| HI | — | 1:100,000 (10 ⁻⁵) | — | — | — | — | — |
| IA | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ID | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IL | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IN | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Weight of evidence based on RfD or other human protection value | — |
| KS | — | 1:100,000 (10 ⁻⁵) | — | — | — | — | — |

47. What carcinogenic risk level (i.e., individual risk within an exposed population) does your state use to issue advisories and/or post waterbodies? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|----------------|
| KY | — | 1:100,000 (10-5) | — | — | — | — | — |
| LA | 1:10,000 (10-4) | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MA | — | — | — | FDA action level | — | generally FDA but sometimes more conservative, depends on the situation | — |
| MD | — | 1:100,000 (10-5) | — | — | — | — | — |
| ME | — | 1:100,000 (10-5) | — | — | — | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | — | — | — | FDA action level | — | — | — |
| MN | — | — | — | — | — | No advisories are currently based on cancer endpoint | Not applicable |
| MO | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | 5 x 10-5 | — |
| MS | 1:10,000 (10-4) | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MT | — | 1:100,000 (10-5) | — | — | — | — | — |
| NC | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Follow EPA guidance in recommended meals per month | — |
| ND | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NE | 1:10,000 (10-4) | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NH | — | 1:100,000 (10-5) | — | — | — | — | — |
| NJ | 1:10,000 (10-4) | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NM | — | 1:100,000 (10-5) | — | — | — | per EPA guidance document | — |
| NV | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY | — | — | — | — | — | Consider multiple issues/factors when issuing advisories. | Not applicable |
| NY SRMT | — | — | 1:1,000,000(10-6) | — | — | — | — |
| OH | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OK | — | 1:100,000 (10-5) | — | — | — | — | — |

47. What carcinogenic risk level (i.e., individual risk within an exposed population) does your state use to issue advisories and/or post waterbodies? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|----------------|
| OR | 1:10,000 (10-4) | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| PA | — | — | — | FDA action level | — | Great Lakes Protocol, and FDA Action Levels | — |
| RI | — | 1:100,000 (10-5) | — | — | — | — | — |
| SC | — | 1:100,000 (10-5) | — | — | — | — | — |
| SD | — | — | — | FDA action level | — | — | — |
| SD CRST | — | — | 1:1,000,000(10-6) | — | — | — | — |
| TN | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | 1:10, 000 typical consumers and 1:100, 000 atypical consumers | — |
| TX | 1:10,000 (10-4) | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| UT | — | — | 1:1,000,000(10-6) | — | — | — | — |
| VA | — | — | 1:1,000,000(10-6) | — | — | — | — |
| VT | — | — | — | FDA action level | — | — | — |
| WA | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Based on review of scientific literature, generally 10-4 to 10-6, subject to comparison with background levels. | — |
| WI | 1:10,000 (10-4) | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| WV | 1:10,000 (10-4) | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| WY | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

48. What sources does your state use to obtain cancer potency factors to help calculate “carcinogenic” health risks? (Please check all that apply.)

| | | | |
|--|----|---|----|
| ATSDR Toxicological Profiles | 15 | Great Lakes Protocol | 4 |
| EPA Fish Guidance documents | 17 | Hazardous Substance Data Bank (HSDB) from the National Library of Medicine | 10 |
| EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | 18 | IARC Monographs | 13 |
| EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | 43 | Other sources (please specify) | 14 |
| EPA Toxicology One-Liners Database (Office of Pesticide Programs) | 5 | Not applicable | 8 |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R08 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|-----|-----|--|-----------------|---------|---------|------|
| AK | ATSDR Toxicological Profiles | EPA Fish Guidance documents | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | Hazardous Substance Data Bank (HSDB) from the National Library of Medicine | IARC Monographs | — | — | — |
| AL | ATSDR Toxicological Profiles | — | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | IARC Monographs | — | — | — |
| AR | ATSDR Toxicological Profiles | — | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | Hazardous Substance Data Bank (HSDB) from the National Library of Medicine | — | — | — | — |

48. What sources does your state use to obtain cancer potency factors to help calculate “carcinogenic” health risks? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R08 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|-----|---|---|---|----------------------|--|-----------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| AZ | ATSDR Toxicological Profiles | — | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | EPA Toxicology One-Liners Database (Office of Pesticide Programs) | — | Hazardous Substance Data Bank (HSDB) from the National Library of Medicine | — | — | — | — |
| CA | ATSDR Toxicological Profiles | — | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | EPA Toxicology One-Liners Database (Office of Pesticide Programs) | — | Hazardous Substance Data Bank (HSDB) from the National Library of Medicine | IARC Monographs | Other sources (please specify) | OEHHA or Cal/EPA CPF | — |
| CO | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| CT | ATSDR Toxicological Profiles | — | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | Great Lakes Protocol | Hazardous Substance Data Bank (HSDB) from the National Library of Medicine | IARC Monographs | — | — | — |

48. What sources does your state use to obtain cancer potency factors to help calculate “carcinogenic” health risks? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R08 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|-----------------------------|---|---|---|-----|--|-----------------|--------------------------------|--|----------------|
| DC | — | EPA Fish Guidance documents | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other sources (please specify) | Guidance for Assessing Chemical Contaminant Data for Use in Fish Advisories Vol. 2 Risk Assessment and Fish Consumption Limits 3rd Ed. | — |
| DE | — | — | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | Other sources (please specify) | EPA Water Quality Criteria documents (304(a)(1) docs) | — |
| FL | — | — | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | EPA Toxicology One-Liners Database (Office of Pesticide Programs) | — | Hazardous Substance Data Bank (HSDB) from the National Library of Medicine | IARC Monographs | Other sources (please specify) | Open literature | — |
| GA | — | — | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

48. What sources does your state use to obtain cancer potency factors to help calculate “carcinogenic” health risks? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R08 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| GU | — | EPA Fish Guidance documents | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| HI | — | — | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| IA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ID | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IL | — | — | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | Other sources (please specify) | EPA PPRTVs, CalEPA | — |
| IN | — | — | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| KS | ATSDR Toxicological Profiles | EPA Fish Guidance documents | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

48. What sources does your state use to obtain cancer potency factors to help calculate “carcinogenic” health risks? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R08 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------|---|------|
| KY | — | — | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| LA | — | — | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MA | ATSDR Toxicological Profiles | EPA Fish Guidance documents | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MD | — | EPA Fish Guidance documents | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Currently, total PCBs is the only carcinogen for which Maryland issues advisories and the cancer potency factor was obtained from EPA Guidance Vol 2. | — |

48. What sources does your state use to obtain cancer potency factors to help calculate “carcinogenic” health risks? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R08 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|---|----------------------|--|-----------------|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| ME | — | — | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | IARC Monographs | Other sources (please specify) | CA-OEHHA | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other sources (please specify) | FDA action level | — |
| MN | — | — | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | EPA Toxicology One-Liners Database (Office of Pesticide Programs) | — | Hazardous Substance Data Bank (HSDB) from the National Library of Medicine | IARC Monographs | — | — | — |
| MO | ATSDR Toxicological Profiles | — | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | Great Lakes Protocol | — | — | Other sources (please specify) | CalEPA | — |
| MS | ATSDR Toxicological Profiles | EPA Fish Guidance documents | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

48. What sources does your state use to obtain cancer potency factors to help calculate “carcinogenic” health risks? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R08 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|------|
| MT | — | EPA Fish Guidance documents | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NC | — | EPA Fish Guidance documents | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| ND | ATSDR Toxicological Profiles | — | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | Other sources (please specify) | EPA & ATSDR literature | — |
| NE | — | — | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NH | — | — | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | IARC Monographs | — | — | — |
| NJ | — | — | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | IARC Monographs | — | — | — |

48. What sources does your state use to obtain cancer potency factors to help calculate “carcinogenic” health risks? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R08 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|-----|----------------------|-----|-----------------|--------------------------------|--|----------------|
| NM | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NV | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY | — | — | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | IARC Monographs | Other sources (please specify) | published literature, NTP database, California EPA | — |
| NY SRMT | ATSDR Toxicological Profiles | EPA Fish Guidance documents | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| OH | — | — | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | Great Lakes Protocol | — | — | — | — | — |
| OK | — | — | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | IARC Monographs | — | — | — |

48. What sources does your state use to obtain cancer potency factors to help calculate “carcinogenic” health risks? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R08 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|-----------------------------|---|---|---|-----|--|-----------------|--------------------------------|---------|------|
| OR | — | EPA Fish Guidance documents | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | Hazardous Substance Data Bank (HSDB) from the National Library of Medicine | — | — | — | — |
| PA | — | — | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| RI | — | — | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| SC | — | EPA Fish Guidance documents | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | EPA Toxicology One-Liners Database (Office of Pesticide Programs) | — | Hazardous Substance Data Bank (HSDB) from the National Library of Medicine | IARC Monographs | — | — | — |
| SD | — | EPA Fish Guidance documents | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | Other sources (please specify) | TERA | — |

48. What sources does your state use to obtain cancer potency factors to help calculate “carcinogenic” health risks? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R08 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|-----|-----|--|-----------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------|
| SD CRST | — | EPA Fish Guidance documents | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| TN | — | — | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| TX | ATSDR Toxicological Profiles | EPA Fish Guidance documents | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | Hazardous Substance Data Bank (HSDB) from the National Library of Medicine | IARC Monographs | Other sources (please specify) | Toxline; other online data searches | — |
| UT | — | EPA Fish Guidance documents | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| VA | — | — | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

48. What sources does your state use to obtain cancer potency factors to help calculate “carcinogenic” health risks? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R08 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----|---|-----|----------------------|-----|-----|--------------------------------|---|----------------|
| VT | — | — | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| WA | ATSDR Toxicological Profiles | — | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | Other sources (please specify) | CAL EPA | — |
| WI | — | — | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | Great Lakes Protocol | — | — | — | — | — |
| WV | ATSDR Toxicological Profiles | EPA Fish Guidance documents | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | Other sources (please specify) | Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Great Lakes Sport Fish Advisory Task Force (PCBs) | — |
| WY | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

49. What method(s) does your state currently use to calculate “noncarcinogenic” health risks and issue fish advisories for individuals who consume fish harvested from your state waters? (Please specify all methods used.)

| | | | |
|---|----|--|----|
| EPA Fish Guidance Document | 24 | FDA Action Levels | 15 |
| Great Lakes Protocol | 9 | Other approach (please specify) | 18 |
| Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | 37 | Not applicable | 2 |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|----------------------------|-----|--|-------------------|---------------------------------|--|----------------|
| AK | EPA Fish Guidance Document | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | FDA Action Levels | Other approach (please specify) | ATSDR Minimal Risk Levels | — |
| AL | EPA Fish Guidance Document | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | FDA Action Levels | — | — | — |
| AR | — | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | FDA Action Levels | — | — | — |
| AZ | — | — | — | — | Other approach (please specify) | State derived risk assessment/ State Tissue Standard | — |
| CA | — | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | — | — | — | — |
| CO | EPA Fish Guidance Document | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | — | — | — | — |
| CT | — | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | — | — | — | — |
| DC | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| DE | — | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | — | — | — | — |

49. What method(s) does your state currently use to calculate “noncarcinogenic” health risks and issue fish advisories for individuals who consume fish harvested from your state waters? (Please specify all methods used.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|----------------------------|----------------------|--|-------------------|---------------------------------|---|------|
| FL | — | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | FDA Action Levels | Other approach (please specify) | Health Advisory Levels determined by DOH toxicologists | — |
| GA | — | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | — | — | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | Other approach (please specify) | See: Madsen et al. 2008. Integrated Environmental Assessment and Management. Volume 4, Number 1. pp. 118-124. | — |
| GU | EPA Fish Guidance Document | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | — | — | — | — |
| HI | — | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | — | — | — | — |
| IA | — | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | — | Other approach (please specify) | ATSDR minimum risk levels | — |
| ID | EPA Fish Guidance Document | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | FDA Action Levels | — | — | — |
| IL | — | Great Lakes Protocol | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | — | — | — | — |
| IN | — | — | — | FDA Action Levels | — | — | — |
| KS | EPA Fish Guidance Document | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| KY | — | Great Lakes Protocol | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | — | — | — | — |

49. What method(s) does your state currently use to calculate “noncarcinogenic” health risks and issue fish advisories for individuals who consume fish harvested from your state waters? (Please specify all methods used.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|----------------------------|----------------------|--|-------------------|---------------------------------|--|----------------|
| LA | — | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | — | — | — | — |
| MA | EPA Fish Guidance Document | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | FDA Action Levels | Other approach (please specify) | Qualitative judgement | — |
| MD | EPA Fish Guidance Document | — | — | — | Other approach (please specify) | MDE's Technical Support Document | — |
| ME | — | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | — | — | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | — | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | FDA Action Levels | — | — | — |
| MN | EPA Fish Guidance Document | Great Lakes Protocol | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | — | — | — | — |
| MO | EPA Fish Guidance Document | Great Lakes Protocol | — | — | Other approach (please specify) | Integrated Exposure Uptake Biokinetic Model for Lead (IEUBK model) | — |
| MS | EPA Fish Guidance Document | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | FDA Action Levels | — | — | — |
| MT | — | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | — | — | — | — |
| NC | — | — | — | — | Other approach (please specify) | EPA guidance in recommended meals per month | — |
| ND | EPA Fish Guidance Document | — | — | — | — | — | — |

49. What method(s) does your state currently use to calculate “noncarcinogenic” health risks and issue fish advisories for individuals who consume fish harvested from your state waters? (Please specify all methods used.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|----------------------------|----------------------|--|-------------------|---------------------------------|---|------|
| NE | — | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | — | — | — | — |
| NH | — | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | — | — | — | — |
| NJ | — | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | FDA Action Levels | — | — | — |
| NM | EPA Fish Guidance Document | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NV | — | — | — | FDA Action Levels | — | — | — |
| NY | — | Great Lakes Protocol | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | FDA Action Levels | Other approach (please specify) | risk assessment | — |
| NY SRMT | EPA Fish Guidance Document | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | — | — | — | — |
| OH | — | Great Lakes Protocol | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | — | — | — | — |
| OK | EPA Fish Guidance Document | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | — | Other approach (please specify) | IEUBK Lead Model | — |
| OR | EPA Fish Guidance Document | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | — | Other approach (please specify) | ATSDR's MRLs | — |
| PA | — | Great Lakes Protocol | — | FDA Action Levels | Other approach (please specify) | Great Lakes protocol for PCB, EPA risk assessment for mercury | — |
| RI | EPA Fish Guidance Document | — | — | — | — | — | — |

49. What method(s) does your state currently use to calculate “noncarcinogenic” health risks and issue fish advisories for individuals who consume fish harvested from your state waters? (Please specify all methods used.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|----------------------------|----------------------|--|-------------------|---------------------------------|---|------|
| SC | EPA Fish Guidance Document | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| SD | EPA Fish Guidance Document | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | FDA Action Levels | — | — | — |
| SD CRST | EPA Fish Guidance Document | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | — | — | — | — |
| TN | EPA Fish Guidance Document | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| TX | EPA Fish Guidance Document | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | — | — | — | — |
| UT | EPA Fish Guidance Document | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | FDA Action Levels | — | — | — |
| VA | — | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | — | Other approach (please specify) | case by case basis | — |
| VT | — | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | — | — | — | — |
| WA | EPA Fish Guidance Document | — | Hazard Index calculations using risk assessment methodology (IRIS RfD) | — | Other approach (please specify) | Comparison with RfD (generally do not express in terms of hazard index) | — |
| WI | — | Great Lakes Protocol | — | — | Other approach (please specify) | Chemical specific health protection values and Great Lakes Consortium Protocols | — |
| WV | — | Great Lakes Protocol | — | — | Other approach (please specify) | Health Protection Value, Minimal Risk Levels | — |

49. What method(s) does your state currently use to calculate “noncarcinogenic” health risks and issue fish advisories for individuals who consume fish harvested from your state waters? (Please specify all methods used.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------------------------------|----------------------|------|
| WY | — | — | — | — | Other approach (please specify) | Determining Approach | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

50. What noncarcinogenic risk level (i.e., individual risk within an exposed population) does your state use to issue advisories and/or post waterbodies?

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|----|-------------------------------|----|
| Hazard index is > 1 | 21 | FDA action levels | 12 |
| Hazard index is => 1 | 4 | Other (please specify) | 17 |
| Hazard index is < 1 | 2 | Not applicable | 6 |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---------------------|----------------------|-----|-------------------|------------------------|---|----------------|
| AK | — | — | — | FDA action levels | — | — | — |
| AL | — | Hazard index is => 1 | — | FDA action levels | — | — | — |
| AR | — | — | — | FDA action levels | — | — | — |
| AZ | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| CA | Hazard index is > 1 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| CO | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| CT | Hazard index is > 1 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| DC | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| DE | Hazard index is > 1 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| FL | Hazard index is > 1 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| GA | Hazard index is > 1 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | See: Madsen et al. 2008. Integrated Environmental Assessment and Management. Volume 4, Number 1. pp. 118-124. | — |
| GU | Hazard index is > 1 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| HI | — | Hazard index is => 1 | — | — | — | — | — |

50. What noncarcinogenic risk level (i.e., individual risk within an exposed population) does your state use to issue advisories and/or post waterbodies? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---------------------|-----|-----|-------------------|------------------------|--|----------------|
| IA | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Use a hybrid risk assessment based upon RfD and MRLs and also accounting for health benefits of eating fish. | — |
| ID | Hazard index is > 1 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| IL | Hazard index is > 1 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| IN | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Indiana bases non-carcinogenic risk level on a maximum average exposure of 0.05ug/kg body wt./day for total PCBs applied to the general population and 0.3 ug/kg/day total mercury applied to the general population. Total exposure is based on a 70 kg adult, an average size meal of 225 grams (8 oz.) and unlimited consumption of 225 meals per year. | — |
| KS | Hazard index is > 1 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| KY | Hazard index is > 1 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| LA | Hazard index is > 1 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MA | — | — | — | FDA action levels | Other (please specify) | Seriousness of health outcome | — |
| MD | Hazard index is > 1 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| ME | Hazard index is > 1 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | — | — | — | FDA action levels | — | — | — |

50. What noncarcinogenic risk level (i.e., individual risk within an exposed population) does your state use to issue advisories and/or post waterbodies? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---------------------|----------------------|-----|-------------------|------------------------|---|------|
| MN | Hazard index is > 1 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MO | — | Hazard index is => 1 | — | FDA action levels | — | — | — |
| MS | — | — | — | FDA action levels | — | — | — |
| MT | Hazard index is > 1 | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | don't know | — |
| NC | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Follow EPA Guidance in recommended meals per month | — |
| ND | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Reference doses. | — |
| NE | Hazard index is > 1 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NH | Hazard index is > 1 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NJ | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Hazard index > risk assessment methods | — |
| NM | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | EPA guidance | — |
| NV | — | — | — | FDA action levels | — | — | — |
| NY | — | — | — | FDA action levels | Other (please specify) | Consider multiple issues/factors when issuing advisories. | — |
| NY SRMT | Hazard index is > 1 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| OH | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Great Lakes Protocol | — |
| OK | Hazard index is > 1 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| OR | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Tissue levels exceeding EPA fish guidance values | — |

50. What noncarcinogenic risk level (i.e., individual risk within an exposed population) does your state use to issue advisories and/or post waterbodies? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------------|---|----------------|
| PA | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Great Lakes Protocol | — |
| RI | Hazard index is > 1 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| SC | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Reference dose, or dose below health protection value | — |
| SD | — | — | — | FDA action levels | — | — | — |
| SD CRST | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| TN | — | — | — | FDA action levels | — | — | — |
| TX | — | Hazard index is => 1 | — | — | — | — | — |
| UT | — | — | Hazard index is < 1 | FDA action levels | — | EPA screening values and risk-based consumption limits. | — |
| VA | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Advisories issued based on # of meals | — |
| VT | Hazard index is > 1 | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| WA | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Exceedance of RfD may trigger possible fish advisory, dependent on other factors as well including background, known benefits, known consumption rates. | — |
| WI | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Unknown | — |
| WV | — | — | Hazard index is < 1 | — | — | — | — |
| WY | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

51. What source does your state use to obtain potency factors (reference dose) to help calculate noncarcinogenic health risks? (Please check all that apply.)

| | | | |
|--|----|---|----|
| ATSDR toxicological profiles | 26 | Great Lakes Protocol | 8 |
| EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | 46 | Hazardous Substance Data Bank (HSDB) from the National Library of Medicine | 8 |
| EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | 19 | Other sources (please specify) | 17 |
| EPA Toxicology One-Liners Database (Office of Pesticide Programs) | 6 | Not applicable | 4 |
| EPA Fish Guidance | 16 | | |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|---|---|-----|-----|-----|--|--------------------------------|--|------|
| AK | ATSDR toxicological profiles | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | Hazardous Substance Data Bank (HSDB) from the National Library of Medicine | — | — | — |
| AL | ATSDR toxicological profiles | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | Other sources (please specify) | all available data from defensible (well conducted, glp compliant) studies | — |
| AR | ATSDR toxicological profiles | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | — | — | — | Hazardous Substance Data Bank (HSDB) from the National Library of Medicine | — | — | — |

**51. What source does your state use to obtain potency factors (reference dose) to help calculate noncarcinogenic health risks?
(Please check all that apply.) (continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|---|---|---|-------------------|----------------------|--|--------------------------------|---|----------------|
| AZ | ATSDR toxicological profiles | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | Hazardous Substance Data Bank (HSDB) from the National Library of Medicine | — | — | — |
| CA | ATSDR toxicological profiles | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | EPA Toxicology One-Liners Database (Office of Pesticide Programs) | — | — | Hazardous Substance Data Bank (HSDB) from the National Library of Medicine | Other sources (please specify) | OEHHA or Cal/EPA REL/RfD value | — |
| CO | ATSDR toxicological profiles | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | EPA Fish Guidance | — | — | Other sources (please specify) | Primary literature, other states' methods | — |
| CT | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | — | — | Great Lakes Protocol | — | Other sources (please specify) | ATSDR | — |
| DC | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| DE | ATSDR toxicological profiles | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

**51. What source does your state use to obtain potency factors (reference dose) to help calculate noncarcinogenic health risks?
(Please check all that apply.) (continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|---|---|---|-------------------|-----|--|--------------------------------|--|----------------|
| FL | ATSDR toxicological profiles | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | EPA Toxicology One-Liners Database (Office of Pesticide Programs) | — | — | Hazardous Substance Data Bank (HSDB) from the National Library of Medicine | Other sources (please specify) | State-sponsored risk-assessment calculations, NC Risk Assessment Document on PCBs 2004 | — |
| GA | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | EPA Fish Guidance | — | — | — | — | — |
| GU | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | EPA Fish Guidance | — | — | — | — | — |
| HI | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| IA | ATSDR toxicological profiles | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

**51. What source does your state use to obtain potency factors (reference dose) to help calculate noncarcinogenic health risks?
(Please check all that apply.) (continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|---|---|-----|-------------------|----------------------|-----|--------------------------------|---|------|
| ID | ATSDR toxicological profiles | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| IL | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | — | — | Great Lakes Protocol | — | Other sources (please specify) | Great Lakes Protocol for PCBs, state-derived values for chlordane and mercury | — |
| IN | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| KS | ATSDR toxicological profiles | — | — | — | EPA Fish Guidance | — | — | — | — | — |
| KY | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| LA | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

**51. What source does your state use to obtain potency factors (reference dose) to help calculate noncarcinogenic health risks?
(Please check all that apply.) (continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|---|---|---|-------------------|----------------------|--|--------------------------------|--|----------------|
| MA | ATSDR toxicological profiles | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | EPA Fish Guidance | — | — | — | — | — |
| MD | — | — | — | — | EPA Fish Guidance | — | — | — | — | — |
| ME | ATSDR toxicological profiles | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | EPA Toxicology One-Liners Database (Office of Pesticide Programs) | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other sources (please specify) | FDA action level, Great Lakes Task Force | — |
| MN | ATSDR toxicological profiles | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | EPA Toxicology One-Liners Database (Office of Pesticide Programs) | EPA Fish Guidance | Great Lakes Protocol | Hazardous Substance Data Bank (HSDB) from the National Library of Medicine | — | — | — |
| MO | ATSDR toxicological profiles | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | — | — | Great Lakes Protocol | Hazardous Substance Data Bank (HSDB) from the National Library of Medicine | Other sources (please specify) | — | — |

**51. What source does your state use to obtain potency factors (reference dose) to help calculate noncarcinogenic health risks?
(Please check all that apply.) (continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|---|---|-----|-------------------|----------------------|-----|--------------------------------|--|------|
| MS | ATSDR toxicological profiles | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | EPA Fish Guidance | — | — | — | — | — |
| MT | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NC | ATSDR toxicological profiles | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | — | EPA Fish Guidance | Great Lakes Protocol | — | Other sources (please specify) | follow EPA Guidance | — |
| ND | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other sources (please specify) | EPA literature. | — |
| NE | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NH | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | — | — | — | — | Other sources (please specify) | NH policy is to use best available science | — |

**51. What source does your state use to obtain potency factors (reference dose) to help calculate noncarcinogenic health risks?
(Please check all that apply.) (continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|---|---|---|-------------------|----------------------|-----|--------------------------------|---|------|
| NJ | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | EPA Toxicology One-Liners Database (Office of Pesticide Programs) | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NM | — | — | — | — | EPA Fish Guidance | — | — | — | — | — |
| NV | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other sources (please specify) | state did not answer | — |
| NY | ATSDR toxicological profiles | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | — | — | Great Lakes Protocol | — | Other sources (please specify) | NTP database, California EPA | — |
| NY SRMT | ATSDR toxicological profiles | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | EPA Fish Guidance | — | — | — | — | — |
| OH | ATSDR toxicological profiles | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | Great Lakes Protocol | — | Other sources (please specify) | USFDA Total Tolerable Daily Intake for Lead | — |

**51. What source does your state use to obtain potency factors (reference dose) to help calculate noncarcinogenic health risks?
(Please check all that apply.) (continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|---|---|---|-------------------|-----|-----|--------------------------------|--|------|
| OK | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| OR | ATSDR toxicological profiles | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | EPA Fish Guidance | — | — | — | — | — |
| PA | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| RI | ATSDR toxicological profiles | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| SC | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | EPA Toxicology One-Liners Database (Office of Pesticide Programs) | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| SD | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | EPA Fish Guidance | — | — | Other sources (please specify) | Toxicology Excellence for Risk Assessment (TERA) | — |

**51. What source does your state use to obtain potency factors (reference dose) to help calculate noncarcinogenic health risks?
(Please check all that apply.) (continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|---|---|-----|-------------------|-----|--|--------------------------------|---|------|
| SD CRST | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | EPA Health Effects Assessment Summary Table (HEAST) | — | EPA Fish Guidance | — | — | — | — | — |
| TN | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| TX | ATSDR toxicological profiles | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | Hazardous Substance Data Bank (HSDB) from the National Library of Medicine | Other sources (please specify) | Toxline; other online data searches; EPA guidance documents | — |
| UT | ATSDR toxicological profiles | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | EPA Fish Guidance | — | — | — | — | — |
| VA | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | Other sources (please specify) | Other available data | — |
| VT | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

**51. What source does your state use to obtain potency factors (reference dose) to help calculate noncarcinogenic health risks?
(Please check all that apply.) (continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|---|-----|-----|-------------------|----------------------|-----|---------|---------|----------------|
| WA | ATSDR toxicological profiles | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| WI | — | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| WV | ATSDR toxicological profiles | EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) | — | — | EPA Fish Guidance | Great Lakes Protocol | — | — | — | — |
| WY | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

52. Enter the % of advisories now in effect which were issued using risk assessment methods, FDA action levels, or other methods specified in question 46 and 49.

| State/Tribe | Percent of advisories now in effect which were issued using: | | | Not Applicable |
|-------------|--|-------------------|--|----------------|
| | Risk Assessment | FDA Action Levels | Other methods specified in Questions 46 and 29 | |
| AK | 100% | Not applicable | Not applicable | — |
| AL | 5 | 60 | 35 | — |
| AR | 0 | 100 | 0 | — |
| AZ | 80 | 20 | 0 | — |
| CA | 95 | 0 | 5 | — |
| CO | 100 | 0 | 0 | — |
| CT | 100 | 0 | 0 | — |
| DC | 100 | 0 | 0 | — |
| DE | 100 | 0 | 0 | — |
| FL | 99 | <1 | <1 | — |
| GA | 100 | 0 | 0 | — |
| GLIFWC | 100% | 0% | 100% | — |
| GU | 100% | 0 | 0 | — |
| HI | 100 | 0 | 0 | — |
| IA | 0 | 100 | 0 | — |
| ID | 100 | 6 | 0 | — |
| IL | 100 | 0 | 0 | — |
| IN | 100 | 0 | 0 | — |
| KS | 100 | 0 | 0 | — |
| KY | 100 | 0 | 0 | — |
| LA | 97 | 0 | 3 | — |
| MA | 7 | 90 | 3 | — |
| MD | 0 | 0 | 100 | — |
| ME | 100 | 0 | 0 | — |

52. Enter the % of advisories now in effect which were issued using risk assessment methods, FDA action levels, or other methods specified in question 46 and 49. (continued)

| State/Tribe | Percent of advisories now in effect which were issued using: | | | Not Applicable |
|-------------|--|-------------------|--|--|
| | Risk Assessment | FDA Action Levels | Other methods specified in Questions 46 and 29 | |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | Not Applicable |
| MI | 50 | 50 | 0 | — |
| MN | 100 | 0 | 0 | — |
| MO | 90 | 0 | 10 | — |
| MS | 90 | 10 | 0 | — |
| MT | 100 | 0 | 0 | — |
| NC | 100 | 0 | 0 | — |
| ND | 0 | 0 | 100 | — |
| NE | 100 | 0 | 0 | — |
| NH | 100 | 0 | 0 | — |
| NJ | 98 | 2 | 0 | — |
| NM | 0 | 0 | 100 | — |
| NV | 0 | 100 | 0 | — |
| NY | — | — | — | Not applicable - consider multiple factors |
| NY SRMT | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OH | 97 | 0 | 3 | — |
| OK | 75 | 0 | 25 | — |
| OR | 100 | 0 | 0 | — |
| PA | 100 | 0 | 100 | — |
| RI | 100 | 0 | 0 | — |
| SC | 100 | 0 | 0 | — |
| SD | 0 | 100 | 0 | — |
| SD CRST | 100 | 0 | 0 | — |
| TN | 54 | 46 | 0 | — |

52. Enter the % of advisories now in effect which were issued using risk assessment methods, FDA action levels, or other methods specified in question 46 and 49. (continued)

| State/Tribe | Percent of advisories now in effect which were issued using: | | | Not Applicable |
|-------------|--|-------------------|--|----------------|
| | Risk Assessment | FDA Action Levels | Other methods specified in Questions 46 and 29 | |
| TX | 100 | 0 | 0 | — |
| UT | 100 | 0 | 0 | — |
| VA | 100 | 0 | 0 | — |
| VT | 95 | 5 | 0 | — |
| WA | 100 | 0 | 0 | — |
| WI | 100 | 0 | 0 | — |
| WV | 100 | 0 | 0 | — |
| WY | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

53. Does your state or tribal agency have a plan to reevaluate data from sites where outdated assessment methods were used to issue fish advisories?

Yes **23**
 No **14**
 Not applicable **19**

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| AK | — | — | Not applicable |
| AL | — | No | — |
| AR | Yes | — | — |
| AZ | Yes | — | — |
| CA | Yes | — | — |
| CO | — | No | — |
| CT | Yes | — | — |
| DC | — | — | Not applicable |
| DE | — | — | Not applicable |
| FL | — | — | Not applicable |
| GA | — | — | Not applicable |
| GLIFWC | — | No | — |
| GU | — | — | Not applicable |
| HI | — | — | Not applicable |
| IA | Yes | — | — |
| ID | — | No | — |
| IL | — | — | Not applicable |
| IN | — | No | — |
| KS | — | — | Not applicable |
| KY | Yes | — | — |
| LA | — | No | — |
| MA | — | — | Not applicable |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| MD | — | No | — |
| ME | — | — | Not applicable |
| ME ABM | Yes | — | — |
| MI | Yes | — | — |
| MN | — | — | Not applicable |
| MO | Yes | — | — |
| MS | Yes | — | — |
| MT | — | No | — |
| NC | Yes | — | — |
| ND | — | — | Not applicable |
| NE | — | No | — |
| NH | — | — | Not applicable |
| NJ | Yes | — | — |
| NM | Yes | — | — |
| NV | — | No | — |
| NY | Yes | — | — |
| NY SRMT | Yes | — | — |
| OH | Yes | — | — |
| OK | Yes | — | — |
| OR | Yes | — | — |
| PA | — | — | Not applicable |
| RI | Yes | — | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| SC | Yes | — | — |
| SD | — | — | Not applicable |
| SD CRST | — | No | — |
| TN | Yes | — | — |
| TX | — | — | Not applicable |
| UT | — | No | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| VA | Yes | — | — |
| VT | — | No | — |
| WA | — | No | — |
| WI | — | — | Not applicable |
| WV | Yes | — | — |
| WY | — | — | Not applicable |

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

54. Is your state currently re-evaluating the method or approach used to establish fish advisories?

Yes **29**
 No **26**
 Not applicable **1**

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| AK | — | No | — |
| AL | — | No | — |
| AR | Yes | — | — |
| AZ | Yes | — | — |
| CA | — | No | — |
| CO | Yes | — | — |
| CT | — | No | — |
| DC | — | No | — |
| DE | Yes | — | — |
| FL | — | No | — |
| GA | — | No | — |
| GLIFWC | Yes | — | — |
| GU | — | No | — |
| HI | Yes | — | — |
| IA | Yes | — | — |
| ID | — | No | — |
| IL | — | — | Not applicable |
| IN | Yes | — | — |
| KS | — | No | — |
| KY | Yes | — | — |
| LA | Yes | — | — |
| MA | Yes | — | — |
| MD | — | No | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| ME | Yes | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | No | — |
| MI | Yes | — | — |
| MN | — | No | — |
| MO | Yes | — | — |
| MS | Yes | — | — |
| MT | — | No | — |
| NC | Yes | — | — |
| ND | — | No | — |
| NE | — | No | — |
| NH | — | No | — |
| NJ | Yes | — | — |
| NM | Yes | — | — |
| NV | Yes | — | — |
| NY | Yes | — | — |
| NY SRMT | Yes | — | — |
| OH | — | No | — |
| OK | Yes | — | — |
| OR | Yes | — | — |
| PA | — | No | — |
| RI | Yes | — | — |
| SC | Yes | — | — |
| SD | — | No | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| SD CRST | — | No | — |
| TN | — | No | — |
| TX | — | No | — |
| UT | — | No | — |
| VA | Yes | — | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| VT | Yes | — | — |
| WA | Yes | — | — |
| WI | — | No | — |
| WV | — | No | — |
| WY | Yes | — | — |

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

55. What default value does your state use in its risk assessments as a daily fish consumption rate for recreational fishers?

| | | | |
|------------|----------|-------------------------|-----------|
| 15 g/day | 2 | 6.5 g/day | 4 |
| 17.5 g/day | 7 | Other consumption rates | 24 |
| 30 g/day | 8 | Not applicable | 11 |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|----------|------------|----------|---|--|----------------|
| AK | — | — | — | — | — | Consumption rates vary dramatically in our state, so we issue guidance in "meals per month" instead | Not applicable |
| AL | — | — | — | 30 g/day | — | — | — |
| AR | — | 15 g/day | — | — | — | — | — |
| AZ | — | — | 17.5 g/day | — | — | — | — |
| CA | — | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 32 g/day | — |
| CO | — | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | Range from 0 to 227 g/meal, depending on recommended meal frequency | — |
| CT | — | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | Range from approx. 7.5 g/day to 32 g/day, depending on advisory | — |
| DC | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| DE | — | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 32.4 g/day (average adult); 24.3 g/day (women of childbearing age); 12.2 g/day (children 0 to 6 yrs old) | — |
| FL | — | — | — | 30 g/day | — | — | — |
| GA | — | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | Tiered system, range from 3g/day to 30 g/day | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| GU | — | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 227 g/day | — |

**55. What default value does your state use in its risk assessments as a daily fish consumption rate for recreational fishers?
(continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|----------|------------|----------|---|--|----------------|
| HI | — | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | State back-calculates consumption rate (if less than one meal per month, advisory is issued) | — |
| IA | — | — | — | 30 g/day | — | — | — |
| ID | — | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 32 | — |
| IL | — | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | Range from 3.7 g/day to 140 g/day, depending on recommended meal frequency | — |
| IN | — | 15 g/day | — | — | — | — | — |
| KS | — | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 7.5 g/day | — |
| KY | — | — | 17.5 g/day | — | — | — | — |
| LA | — | — | — | 30 g/day | — | — | — |
| MA | — | — | 17.5 g/day | — | — | — | — |
| MD | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ME | — | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 32.4 g/day | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 286 g/day | — |
| MI | — | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | risk assessment specific | — |
| MN | — | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | Does not assume rate for fish advisories | — |
| MO | — | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 32.4 | — |
| MS | — | — | 17.5 g/day | — | — | — | — |
| MT | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

**55. What default value does your state use in its risk assessments as a daily fish consumption rate for recreational fishers?
(continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----------|-----|------------|----------|---|---|----------------|
| NC | — | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | dioxin advisory set at 0-1 meal per month, mercury advisories begin at 0-1 meal per week | — |
| ND | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NE | — | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 32.5 g/day | — |
| NH | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NJ | — | — | 17.5 g/day | — | — | — | — |
| NM | — | — | — | — | — | We do not calculate our own risk assessments; we follow EPA guidance. | Not applicable |
| NV | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY | — | — | — | 30 g/day | — | Consider multiple factors when issuing fish advisories. | — |
| NY SRMT | — | — | 17.5 g/day | — | — | — | — |
| OH | — | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | For WQS purposes, Ohio uses 15 g/day for the Lake Erie basin and 17.5 g/day for the Ohio River basin. | — |
| OK | 6.5 g/day | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| OR | — | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 15-20 g/day; other rates for special risk groups if known | — |
| PA | — | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | Great Lakes Protocol for PCB, EPA for Hg | — |
| RI | — | — | — | 30 g/day | — | — | — |
| SC | — | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | Range from 3.7 g/day to 140 g/day | — |
| SD | — | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 8 g/day | — |
| SD CRST | — | — | — | 30 g/day | — | — | — |

**55. What default value does your state use in its risk assessments as a daily fish consumption rate for recreational fishers?
(continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----------|-----|------------|----------|---|---|----------------|
| TN | 6.5 g/day | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| TX | — | — | — | 30 g/day | — | — | — |
| UT | — | — | 17.5 g/day | — | — | — | — |
| VA | 6.5 g/day | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| VT | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WA | — | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | No default - generally, we solve for the consumption rate (dependent variable). May use site specific consumption rate if known and reliable. | — |
| WI | — | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | advice suggests the consumption rate to prevent ingestion above health protection value or Rfd | — |
| WV | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WY | 6.5 g/day | — | — | — | — | — | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

56. What default value does your state use in its risk assessments as a daily fish consumption rate for subsistence fishers?

142 g/day **2**
 30 g/day **4**
 6.5 g/day **1**

Other consumption rates **24**
 Not applicable **25**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R03 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|----------|-----|---|---|----------------|
| AK | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| AL | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 227g/day for a 70kg individual | — |
| AR | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 17.5 g/day | — |
| AZ | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | Varies according to group | — |
| CA | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 32 g/day | — |
| CO | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| CT | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | Range from approximately 7.5 g/day to 32 g/day, depending on advisory | — |
| DC | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 227 | — |
| DE | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | Same as response to Question 55. | — |
| FL | — | 30 g/day | — | — | — | — |
| GA | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | Not separately assessed | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| GU | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 227 g/day | — |
| HI | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | State back-calculates consumption rate | — |
| IA | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

**56. What default value does your state use in its risk assessments as a daily fish consumption rate for subsistence fishers?
(continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R03 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|----------|-----|---|--|----------------|
| ID | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IL | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | Unlimited consumption is 140 g/day | — |
| IN | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| KS | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 7.5 g/day | — |
| KY | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 142.4 g/day (the value EPA is currently recommending) | — |
| LA | — | 30 g/day | — | — | — | — |
| MA | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 142.4 g/day (the value EPA is currently recommending) | — |
| MD | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ME | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 286 g/day | — |
| MI | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | Risk assessment specific | — |
| MN | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | Does not assume rate for fish advisories | — |
| MO | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MS | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | Not established | — |
| MT | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NC | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | dioxin advisory set at 0-1 meal per month, mercury advisories begin at 0-1 meal per week | — |
| ND | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NE | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NH | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

**56. What default value does your state use in its risk assessments as a daily fish consumption rate for subsistence fishers?
(continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R03 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----------|----------|-----------|---|--|----------------|
| NJ | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NM | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NV | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY | — | — | — | — | Consider multiple factors when issuing fish advisories. | Not applicable |
| NY SRMT | — | — | 142 g/day | — | — | — |
| OH | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OK | — | 30 g/day | — | — | — | — |
| OR | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 175 g/d | — |
| PA | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| RI | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| SC | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 140 g/day | — |
| SD | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 8 g/day | — |
| SD CRST | — | 30 g/day | — | — | — | — |
| TN | 6.5 g/day | — | — | — | — | — |
| TX | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| UT | — | — | 142 g/day | — | — | — |
| VA | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| VT | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WA | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | No default - generally we solve for the consumption rate (dependent variable) which applies to general or subsistence fishers. | — |
| WI | — | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | advice suggests consumption rate to prevent ingestion above health protection value or RfD | — |
| WV | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

**56. What default value does your state use in its risk assessments as a daily fish consumption rate for subsistence fishers?
(continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R03 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|-----|-----|---------|---------|----------------|
| WY | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

57. What default value does your state use in its risk assessments as a daily fish consumption rate for children?4.0 g/day **2**6.5 g/day **3**Other consumption rates **24**Not applicable **27**

| State/Tribe | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----------|-----------|---|---|----------------|
| AK | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| AL | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| AR | — | 6.5 g/day | — | — | — |
| AZ | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | Varies according to weight | — |
| CA | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| CO | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | Range from 0 to 113 g/day, depending on recommended meal frequency | — |
| CT | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | Range from approximately 7.5 g/day to 32 g/day, depending on advisory | — |
| DC | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 85 | — |
| DE | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 12.2 g/day | — |
| FL | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | Assume proportionally less consumption than adult | — |
| GA | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | Not separately assessed | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| GU | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 85 g/day | — |
| HI | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | State back-calculates consumption rate | — |
| IA | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ID | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 9 | — |
| IL | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IN | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| KS | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 7.5 g/day | — |
| KY | 4.0 g/day | — | — | — | — |
| LA | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 15 | — |
| MA | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

57. What default value does your state use in its risk assessments as a daily fish consumption rate for children? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----------|-----------|---|--|----------------|
| MD | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ME | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ME ABM | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 286 g/day | — |
| MI | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | State sets advisory consumption rates | — |
| MN | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | Does not assume rate for fish advisories | — |
| MO | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 12.15 | — |
| MS | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | Not established | — |
| MT | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NC | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | dioxin advisory set at 0-1 meal per month, mercury advisories begin at 0-1 meal per week | — |
| ND | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NE | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NH | — | — | — | Depends on specific age group being assessed. | Not applicable |
| NJ | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NM | — | — | — | We do not calculate our own risk assessments; we follow EPA guidance. | Not applicable |
| NV | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY | — | — | — | Consider multiple factors when issuing fish advisories. | Not applicable |
| NY SRMT | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OH | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OK | — | 6.5 g/day | — | — | — |
| OR | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 10 g/d | — |
| PA | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| RI | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| SC | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| SD | 4.0 g/day | — | — | — | — |
| SD CRST | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | — | — |

57. What default value does your state use in its risk assessments as a daily fish consumption rate for children? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|-----------|---|--|----------------|
| TN | — | 6.5 g/day | — | — | — |
| TX | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 15 g/day | — |
| UT | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | 11 g/day for 16 kg child; 7 g/day for 10 kg child. | — |
| VA | — | — | — | not specified | Not applicable |
| VT | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WA | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | Calculate weight/age specific consumption rates. | — |
| WI | — | — | Other consumption rates (please specify value in g/day) | see above, advice is provided in meal frequency so no assumptions are needed | — |
| WV | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WY | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

58. What default value does your state use for exposure duration in its cancer risk assessments?30 years **10**70 years **30**Other exposure duration **2**Not applicable **14**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|----------|----------|---|--|----------------|
| AK | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| AL | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| AR | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| AZ | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| CA | 30 years | — | — | — | — |
| CO | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| CT | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| DC | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| DE | — | — | Other exposure duration (please specify value in years) | 30 years for adults and 6 years for children | — |
| FL | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| GA | 30 years | — | — | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| GU | 30 years | — | — | — | — |
| HI | 30 years | — | — | — | — |
| IA | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ID | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IL | 30 years | — | — | — | — |
| IN | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| KS | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| KY | 30 years | — | — | — | — |
| LA | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| MA | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| MD | 30 years | — | — | — | — |

58. What default value does your state use for exposure duration in its cancer risk assessments? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|----------|----------|---|---|----------------|
| ME | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | 30 years | — | — | — | — |
| MN | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| MO | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MS | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| MT | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NC | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| ND | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| NE | — | — | Other exposure duration (please specify value in years) | 10 years, 30 years, and 71 years (71 yrs for advisory status) | — |
| NH | 30 years | — | — | — | — |
| NJ | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| NM | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NV | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| OH | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| OK | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| OR | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| PA | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| RI | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| SC | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| SD | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| SD CRST | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| TN | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| TX | 30 years | — | — | — | — |

58. What default value does your state use for exposure duration in its cancer risk assessments? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|----------|---------|---------|----------------|
| UT | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| VA | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| VT | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| WA | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| WI | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| WV | — | 70 years | — | — | — |
| WY | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

59. What default value does your state use to estimate life expectancy in its risk assessments?70 years **32**75 years **1**Other life expectancy **2**Not applicable **21**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|----------|----------|---|--|----------------|
| AK | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| AL | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| AR | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| AZ | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| CA | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| CO | — | — | Other life expectancy (please specify value in years) | Chronic exposure for non-cancer endpoints (see methylmercury advisory document for CO) | — |
| CT | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| DC | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| DE | — | 75 years | — | — | — |
| FL | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| GA | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| GU | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| HI | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| IA | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ID | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IL | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| IN | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| KS | — | — | — | Not a variable in assessment | Not applicable |
| KY | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| LA | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| MA | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| MD | 70 years | — | — | — | — |

59. What default value does your state use to estimate life expectancy in its risk assessments? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|----------|-----|---|----------|----------------|
| ME | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| MN | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MO | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MS | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MT | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NC | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ND | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NE | — | — | Other life expectancy (please specify value in years) | 71 years | — |
| NH | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| NJ | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| NM | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NV | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OH | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OK | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OR | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| PA | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| RI | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| SC | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| SD | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| SD CRST | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| TN | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| TX | 70 years | — | — | — | — |

59. What default value does your state use to estimate life expectancy in its risk assessments? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|----------|-----|---------|---------|----------------|
| UT | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| VA | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| VT | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| WA | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| WI | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| WV | 70 years | — | — | — | — |
| WY | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

60. Does your state recommend a meal frequency format or number of meals over time in its advisories (e.g., number of meals per month)?

Yes **54**
 No **1**
 Not applicable **1**

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| AK | Yes | — | — |
| AL | Yes | — | — |
| AR | Yes | — | — |
| AZ | Yes | — | — |
| CA | Yes | — | — |
| CO | Yes | — | — |
| CT | Yes | — | — |
| DC | Yes | — | — |
| DE | Yes | — | — |
| FL | Yes | — | — |
| GA | Yes | — | — |
| GLIFWC | Yes | — | — |
| GU | Yes | — | — |
| HI | Yes | — | — |
| IA | Yes | — | — |
| ID | Yes | — | — |
| IL | Yes | — | — |
| IN | Yes | — | — |
| KS | Yes | — | — |
| KY | Yes | — | — |
| LA | Yes | — | — |
| MA | Yes | — | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| MD | Yes | — | — |
| ME | Yes | — | — |
| ME ABM | Yes | — | — |
| MI | Yes | — | — |
| MN | Yes | — | — |
| MO | Yes | — | — |
| MS | Yes | — | — |
| MT | Yes | — | — |
| NC | Yes | — | — |
| ND | Yes | — | — |
| NE | Yes | — | — |
| NH | Yes | — | — |
| NJ | Yes | — | — |
| NM | Yes | — | — |
| NV | Yes | — | — |
| NY | Yes | — | — |
| NY SRMT | Yes | — | — |
| OH | Yes | — | — |
| OK | Yes | — | — |
| OR | Yes | — | — |
| PA | Yes | — | — |
| RI | Yes | — | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| SC | Yes | — | — |
| SD | Yes | — | — |
| SD CRST | Yes | — | — |
| TN | — | No | — |
| TX | Yes | — | — |
| UT | Yes | — | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| VA | Yes | — | — |
| VT | Yes | — | — |
| WA | Yes | — | — |
| WI | Yes | — | — |
| WV | Yes | — | — |
| WY | — | — | Not applicable |

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

61. If your response to question 60 is yes, what assumption does your state make in its risk assessments about meal size or portion for adults? (Please specify all that apply.)

4 oz (114 g) **3**

8 oz (227 g) **41**

Other (please specify value in grams) **11**

Not applicable **3**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|-----|-----|---------------------------------------|---|----------------|
| AK | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | 170 gm (6 oz) | — |
| AL | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | 8.0 oz raw/ 6.0 oz cooked | — |
| AR | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | 6 oz (170 g) | — |
| AZ | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| CA | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| CO | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| CT | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| DC | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| DE | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | 6 oz for women of childbearing age | — |
| FL | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | Advisory states the frequency a 6 ounce meal may be consumed. | — |
| GA | 4 oz (114 g) | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | a range of 4 to 8 oz | — |
| GLIFWC | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| GU | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| HI | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| IA | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | 6-7 oz (170-200 g) | — |
| ID | 4 oz (114 g) | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| IL | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| IN | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| KS | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| KY | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| LA | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| MA | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

61. If your response to question 60 is yes, what assumption does your state make in its risk assessments about meal size or portion for adults? (Please specify all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|-----|-----|---------------------------------------|---|----------------|
| MD | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| ME | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| ME ABM | 4 oz (114 g) | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MI | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | Risk assessment specific | — |
| MN | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | meal size to bw ratio of 227 gram/70 kg | — |
| MO | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| MS | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| MT | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| NC | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | 6 oz cooked fish for adults | — |
| ND | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | 8 oz for all women and 10 oz for all men. | — |
| NE | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| NH | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| NJ | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| NM | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | per EPA guidance | — |
| NV | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| NY | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| OH | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| OK | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| OR | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| PA | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| RI | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| SC | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| SD | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | 7 oz | — |
| SD CRST | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| TN | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

61. If your response to question 60 is yes, what assumption does your state make in its risk assessments about meal size or portion for adults? (Please specify all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|--------------|-----|-----|---------|---------|----------------|
| TX | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| UT | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| VA | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| VT | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| WA | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| WI | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| WV | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| WY | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

62. If your response to question 60 is yes, what assumption does your state make in its risk assessments about meal size or portion for children? (Please specify all that apply.)

4 oz (114 g) 16

8 oz (227 g) 5

Other (please specify value in grams) 24

Not applicable 11

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|-----|---------------------------------------|---|----------------|
| AK | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | 85 g (3 oz) | — |
| AL | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | does not differentiate meal size for children | — |
| AR | 4 oz (114 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| AZ | 4 oz (114 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| CA | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | Assume consumption proportional to weight. Tell children to eat smaller portions. | — |
| CO | 4 oz (114 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| CT | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — |
| DC | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | 3 oz (85 g) | — |
| DE | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | 3 oz | — |
| FL | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | Proportionally less than adults | — |
| GA | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | Not assessed | — |
| GLIFWC | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — |
| GU | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | 85 g/day | — |
| HI | 4 oz (114 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| IA | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ID | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | 2.25 oz | — |
| IL | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | Assumed that meal size is proportional to body weight | — |
| IN | 4 oz (114 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| KS | 4 oz (114 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| KY | 4 oz (114 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| LA | 4 oz (114 g) | — | — | — | — | — |

62. If your response to question 60 is yes, what assumption does your state make in its risk assessments about meal size or portion for children? (Please specify all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|-----|---------------------------------------|---|----------------|
| MA | — | — | — | — | 6 | Not applicable |
| MD | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | 3 oz (85.05 g) | — |
| ME | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | Not typically evaluated | — |
| ME ABM | 4 oz (114 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| MI | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | Risk assessment specific | — |
| MN | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | meal size to bw ratio of 227 gram/70 kg | — |
| MO | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | 3 oz for children--based on calculation from state survey | — |
| MS | 4 oz (114 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| MT | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — |
| NC | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | 2 oz cooked fish | — |
| ND | 4 oz (114 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| NE | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — |
| NH | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | 3 oz. for young children | — |
| NJ | — | 8 oz (227 g) | — | — | — | — |
| NM | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | per EPA guidance | — |
| NV | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | state did not answer | — |
| NY | — | — | — | — | Issue special protective advice for children based on other considerations. | Not applicable |
| NY SRMT | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OH | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OK | 4 oz (114 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| OR | 4 oz (114 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| PA | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| RI | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| SC | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | For mercury we issue do not eat advisories for children in all cases. | — |

62. If your response to question 60 is yes, what assumption does your state make in its risk assessments about meal size or portion for children? (Please specify all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|--------------|-----|-----|---------------------------------------|---|----------------|
| SD | 4 oz (114 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| SD CRST | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | No consumption | — |
| TN | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| TX | 4 oz (114 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| UT | 4 oz (114 g) | — | — | — | — | — |
| VA | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| VT | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WA | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | Give out specific consumption rates based on body weight. | — |
| WI | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | Assume that meal size is proportional to body size | — |
| WV | — | — | — | Other (please specify value in grams) | 3 oz (52.5 g) | — |
| WY | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

63. What default value does your state use for body weight of an adult male consumer in its risk assessments?

| | | | |
|-------|-----------|---|----------|
| 71 kg | 2 | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | 4 |
| 70 kg | 44 | Not applicable | 5 |
| 65 kg | 1 | | |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-------|-------|-----|---|---------|----------------|
| AK | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| AL | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| AR | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| AZ | 71 kg | — | — | — | — | — |
| CA | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| CO | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| CT | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| DC | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| DE | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| FL | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| GA | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| GU | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| HI | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| IA | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| ID | — | — | — | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | 80 kg | — |
| IL | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| IN | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| KS | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| KY | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| LA | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| MA | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| MD | — | — | — | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | 76 kg | — |

63. What default value does your state use for body weight of an adult male consumer in its risk assessments? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-------|-------|-------|---|---|----------------|
| ME | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | — | — | — | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | risk assessment specific | — |
| MN | — | — | — | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | meal size to bw ratio of 227 gram/70 kg | — |
| MO | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| MS | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| MT | 71 kg | — | — | — | — | — |
| NC | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| ND | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| NE | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| NH | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| NJ | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| NM | — | 70 kg | — | — | per EPA guidance | — |
| NV | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| OH | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| OK | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| OR | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| PA | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| RI | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| SC | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| SD | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| SD CRST | — | — | 65 kg | — | — | — |
| TN | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| TX | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| UT | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |

63. What default value does your state use for body weight of an adult male consumer in its risk assessments? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|-------|-----|---------|---------|----------------|
| VA | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| VT | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| WA | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| WI | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| WV | — | 70 kg | — | — | — | — |
| WY | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

64. What default value does your state use for body weight of an adult female consumer (including pregnant women and nursing mothers) in its risk assessments?

| | | | |
|-------|-----------|---|-----------|
| 70 kg | 25 | 60 kg | 10 |
| 65 kg | 3 | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | 6 |
| 62 kg | 3 | Not applicable | 9 |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-------|-------|-----|-------|---|---|----------------|
| AK | — | — | — | 60 kg | — | ATSDR's value used to derive MRL for Hg | — |
| AL | — | — | — | 60 kg | — | — | — |
| AR | — | 65 kg | — | — | — | — | — |
| AZ | — | — | — | 60 kg | — | — | — |
| CA | 70 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| CO | 70 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| CT | — | — | — | 60 kg | — | — | — |
| DC | — | — | — | — | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | 65 kg Women, 64 kg Women of reproductive age, nursing or pregnant | — |
| DE | — | 65 kg | — | — | — | — | — |
| FL | — | — | — | 60 kg | — | — | — |
| GA | 70 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| GLIFWC | 70 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| GU | 70 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| HI | 70 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| IA | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ID | 70 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| IL | — | — | — | 60 kg | — | — | — |
| IN | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| KS | 70 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| KY | 70 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| LA | 70 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |

64. What default value does your state use for body weight of an adult female consumer (including pregnant women and nursing mothers) in its risk assessments? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|---|----------------|
| MA | 70 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MD | — | — | — | — | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | 67 kg | — |
| ME | — | — | — | 60 kg | — | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | — | — | — | — | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | risk assessment specific | — |
| MN | — | — | — | — | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | meal size to bw ratio of 227 gram/70 kg | — |
| MO | — | — | — | 60 kg | — | — | — |
| MS | 70 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MT | — | 65 kg | — | — | — | — | — |
| NC | 70 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| ND | — | — | — | 60 kg | — | — | — |
| NE | 70 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NH | — | — | 62 kg | — | — | — | — |
| NJ | — | — | 62 kg | — | — | — | — |
| NM | — | — | — | — | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | per EPA guidance | — |
| NV | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY | 70 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NY SRMT | 70 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| OH | 70 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| OK | 70 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| OR | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| PA | 70 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| RI | 70 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| SC | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| SD | 70 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| SD CRST | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

64. What default value does your state use for body weight of an adult female consumer (including pregnant women and nursing mothers) in its risk assessments? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-------|-----|-------|-------|---|---------------------------|----------------|
| TN | 70 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| TX | 70 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| UT | 70 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| VA | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| VT | — | — | 62 kg | — | — | — | — |
| WA | — | — | — | 60 kg | — | — | — |
| WI | — | — | — | — | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | proportional to meal size | — |
| WV | 70 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| WY | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

65. What default value does your state use for body weight of a child in its risk assessments?

| | | | |
|---------|----------|---|-----------|
| 10 kg | 6 | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | 17 |
| 14.5 kg | 7 | Risk assessments are not conducted for children | 11 |
| 15.5 kg | 2 | Not applicable | 13 |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R04 | R_NA |
|-------------|-------|---------|---------|---|--------------------------------|---|----------------|
| AK | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| AL | — | — | — | — | — | Risk assessments are not conducted for children | — |
| AR | — | — | — | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | 16 kg | — | — |
| AZ | — | — | 15.5 kg | — | — | — | — |
| CA | — | — | — | — | — | Risk assessments are not conducted for children | — |
| CO | — | — | — | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | 18 kg | — | — |
| CT | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| DC | — | 14.5 kg | — | — | — | — | — |
| DE | — | 14.5 kg | — | — | — | — | — |
| FL | 10 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| GA | — | — | — | — | — | Risk assessments are not conducted for children | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | 70 kg used for all populations | — | — |
| GU | — | — | — | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | 14 kg | — | — |
| HI | — | 14.5 kg | — | — | — | — | — |
| IA | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ID | — | — | — | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | 20 kg | — | — |
| IL | — | — | — | — | — | Risk assessments are not conducted for children | — |
| IN | 10 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| KS | — | — | — | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | 36 kg | — | — |
| KY | 10 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |

65. What default value does your state use for body weight of a child in its risk assessments? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R04 | R_NA |
|-------------|-------|---------|-----|---|---|---|----------------|
| LA | — | — | — | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | 35 | — | — |
| MA | — | — | — | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | 35 | — | — |
| MD | — | 14.5 kg | — | — | — | — | — |
| ME | — | — | — | — | — | Risk assessments are not conducted for children | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | — | — | — | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | Risk assessment specific, commonly 15 kg for <6 yrs old | — | — |
| MN | — | — | — | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | meal size to bw ratio of 227 gram/70 kg | — | — |
| MO | 10 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MS | — | — | — | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | Not established | — | — |
| MT | 10 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NC | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ND | — | — | — | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | 20 kg | — | — |
| NE | — | — | — | — | — | Risk assessments are not conducted for children | — |
| NH | — | — | — | — | Depends on specific age group being assessed. | — | Not applicable |
| NJ | — | — | — | — | — | Risk assessments are not conducted for children | — |
| NM | — | — | — | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | per EPA guidance | — | — |
| NV | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY | — | — | — | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | Age-dependent weights. Consider multiple factors when issuing advisories, particularly for children (high risk group) | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

65. What default value does your state use for body weight of a child in its risk assessments? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R04 | R_NA |
|-------------|-------|---------|---------|---|---|---|----------------|
| OH | — | — | — | — | — | Risk assessments are not conducted for children | — |
| OK | — | 14.5 kg | — | — | — | — | — |
| OR | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| PA | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| RI | 10 kg | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| SC | — | — | — | — | — | Risk assessments are not conducted for children | — |
| SD | — | 14.5 kg | — | — | — | — | — |
| SD CRST | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| TN | — | — | — | — | — | Risk assessments are not conducted for children | — |
| TX | — | — | — | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | 35 kg and 15kg | — | — |
| UT | — | — | 15.5 kg | — | — | — | — |
| VA | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| VT | — | — | — | — | — | Risk assessments are not conducted for children | — |
| WA | — | — | — | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | Give out weight specific consumption rates ranging from 25 lbs up to 300 lbs. | — | — |
| WI | — | — | — | Other weight (please specify value in kg) | proportional to meal size | — | — |
| WV | — | 14.5 kg | — | — | — | — | — |
| WY | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

66. Please specify what age range or ranges your state uses to calculate risk with respect to children. (Please specify all age ranges used in your state's risk assessments for children.)

| | | | |
|-----------|----|---|----|
| <6 years | 16 | <18 years | 2 |
| <7 years | 5 | Other age ranges (please specify age) | 7 |
| <12 years | 6 | Risk assessments are not conducted for children | 13 |
| <15 years | 7 | Not applicable | 7 |

| State/Tribe | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R07 | R_NA |
|-------------|----------|-----|-----------|-----------|-----|---------------------------------------|--|---|----------------|
| AK | — | — | <12 years | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| AL | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Risk assessments are not conducted for children | — |
| AR | <6 years | — | <12 years | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| AZ | <6 years | — | — | — | — | Other age ranges (please specify age) | 16 years | — | — |
| CA | — | — | — | — | — | Other age ranges (please specify age) | Mercury advice for women of childbearing age applied to children age 17 and under. | Risk assessments are not conducted for children | — |
| CO | — | — | <12 years | — | — | — | 0–9 years - age range for children | — | — |
| CT | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| DC | <6 years | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| DE | <6 years | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| FL | — | — | — | — | — | Other age ranges (please specify age) | < 10 years | — | — |
| GA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Risk assessments are not conducted for children | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | <15 years | — | — | — | — | — |
| GU | <6 years | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| HI | <6 years | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

66. Please specify what age range or ranges your state uses to calculate risk with respect to children. (Please specify all age ranges used in your state's risk assessments for children. (continued))

| State/Tribe | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R07 | R_NA |
|-------------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|--|---|----------------|
| IA | — | — | — | — | — | Other age ranges (please specify age) | <16 years | — | — |
| ID | — | — | — | — | <18 years | — | — | — | — |
| IL | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Risk assessments are not conducted for children | — |
| IN | — | — | — | <15 years | — | — | — | — | — |
| KS | — | — | <12 years | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| KY | <6 years | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| LA | — | <7 years | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MA | — | — | <12 years | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MD | <6 years | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| ME | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Risk assessments are not conducted for children | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Risk assessments are not conducted for children | — |
| MI | <6 years | — | — | — | — | Other age ranges (please specify age) | Risk assessment specific, common is <6 yr. 6–14 yr | — | — |
| MN | — | — | — | <15 years | — | — | — | — | — |
| MO | — | — | — | — | — | Other age ranges (please specify age) | <13 | — | — |
| MS | — | <7 years | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MT | <6 years | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NC | — | — | — | <15 years | — | — | — | — | — |
| ND | — | — | — | <15 years | — | — | — | — | — |
| NE | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

66. Please specify what age range or ranges your state uses to calculate risk with respect to children. (Please specify all age ranges used in your state's risk assessments for children. (continued))

| State/Tribe | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R07 | R_NA |
|-------------|----------|----------|-----|-----------|-----------|---------------------------------------|--|---|----------------|
| NH | — | <7 years | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NJ | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Risk assessments are not conducted for children | — |
| NM | — | — | — | — | — | — | per EPA guidance | Risk assessments are not conducted for children | — |
| NV | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY | — | — | — | <15 years | <18 years | — | Consider multiple factors when issuing advisories, particularly for children (high risk group) | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Risk assessments are not conducted for children | — |
| OH | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Risk assessments are not conducted for children | — |
| OK | — | — | — | — | — | Other age ranges (please specify age) | <6 for pesticides, <15 for mercury | — | — |
| OR | <6 years | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| PA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| RI | <6 years | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| SC | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Risk assessments are not conducted for children | — |
| SD | — | <7 years | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| SD CRST | <6 years | <7 years | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |

66. Please specify what age range or ranges your state uses to calculate risk with respect to children. (Please specify all age ranges used in your state's risk assessments for children. (continued))

| State/Tribe | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R07 | R_NA |
|-------------|----------|-----|-----------|-----------|-----|---------|--|---|----------------|
| TN | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Risk assessments are not conducted for children | — |
| TX | <6 years | — | <12 years | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| UT | <6 years | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| VA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| VT | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Risk assessments are not conducted for children | — |
| WA | <6 years | — | — | — | — | — | Varies depending on chemical. Generally age 6 and under. CURRENTLY UNDER REVIEW | — | — |
| WI | — | — | — | <15 years | — | — | — | — | — |
| WV | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WY | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

67. What assumption does your state make in its risk assessments about the amount of the pollutant absorbed by the body after ingestion (percent absorption by the gut) (e.g., in pharmacokinetic modeling)?

100% for all pollutants **25** Other (please specify percent absorption assumed) **8**
 Chemical-specific percentage based on available data **13** Not applicable **10**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-------------------------|--|---|--|----------------|
| AK | | Chemical-specific percentage based on available data | | | |
| AL | | Chemical-specific percentage based on available data | | | |
| AR | | Chemical-specific percentage based on available data | | | |
| AZ | | Chemical-specific percentage based on available data | | | |
| CA | 100% for all pollutants | | | If supported by data | |
| CO | | | Other (please specify percent absorption assumed) | 90–99% (90% general population, 99% children ages 3–5) | |
| CT | 100% for all pollutants | | | | |
| DC | | Chemical-specific percentage based on available data | | | |
| DE | 100% for all pollutants | | | | |
| FL | 100% for all pollutants | | | | |
| GA | 100% for all pollutants | | | | |
| GLIFWC | | | | | Not applicable |
| GU | 100% for all pollutants | | | | |
| HI | 100% for all pollutants | | | | |
| IA | | | | | Not applicable |
| ID | 100% for all pollutants | | | | |
| IL | 100% for all pollutants | | | | |
| IN | | Chemical-specific percentage based on available data | | | |

67. What assumption does your state make in its risk assessments about the amount of the pollutant absorbed by the body after ingestion (percent absorption by the gut) (e.g., in pharmacokinetic modeling)? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------------|----------------|
| KS | 100% for all pollutants | | | | |
| KY | | Chemical-specific percentage based on available data | | | |
| LA | | Chemical-specific percentage based on available data | | | |
| MA | 100% for all pollutants | | | | |
| MD | 100% for all pollutants | | | | |
| ME | | Chemical-specific percentage based on available data | | | |
| ME ABM | | | | | Not applicable |
| MI | | Chemical-specific percentage based on available data | | | |
| MN | 100% for all pollutants | | | | |
| MO | 100% for all pollutants | | | | |
| MS | | | Other (please specify percent absorption assumed) | Not established | |
| MT | | | Other (please specify percent absorption assumed) | 100%, Hg and PCB's only | |
| NC | 100% for all pollutants | | | | |
| ND | 100% for all pollutants | | | | |
| NE | 100% for all pollutants | | | | |
| NH | | | | | Not applicable |
| NJ | 100% for all pollutants | | | | |
| NM | | | | | Not applicable |
| NV | | | | | Not applicable |
| NY | | | Other (please specify percent absorption assumed) | Depends on basis for toxic endpoint. | |
| NY SRMT | | | | | Not applicable |

67. What assumption does your state make in its risk assessments about the amount of the pollutant absorbed by the body after ingestion (percent absorption by the gut) (e.g., in pharmacokinetic modeling)? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R04 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-------------------------|--|---|--|----------------|
| OH | | | | | Not applicable |
| OK | | Chemical-specific percentage based on available data | | | |
| OR | 100% for all pollutants | | | | |
| PA | 100% for all pollutants | | | | |
| RI | 100% for all pollutants | | | | |
| SC | | Chemical-specific percentage based on available data | | | |
| SD | | | | | Not applicable |
| SD CRST | 100% for all pollutants | | | | |
| TN | | | Other (please specify percent absorption assumed) | None | |
| TX | 100% for all pollutants | | | | |
| UT | | | Other (please specify percent absorption assumed) | varies with pollutant | |
| VA | 100% for all pollutants | | | | |
| VT | | Chemical-specific percentage based on available data | | | |
| WA | | | Other (please specify percent absorption assumed) | chemical dependent | |
| WI | | | Other (please specify percent absorption assumed) | No advice is necessary since advice is based on fish ingestion studies | |
| WV | 100% for all pollutants | | | | |
| WY | | | | | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

68. Does your state use “contaminant reduction factors” in its risk calculations to account for contaminant losses of PCBs and other organochlorine pollutants from fish tissues during cleaning, preparation, and cooking of the fish?

Yes **18**
 No **31**
 Not applicable **7**

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| AK | — | No | — |
| AL | — | No | — |
| AR | Yes | — | — |
| AZ | — | No | — |
| CA | Yes | — | — |
| CO | — | No | — |
| CT | Yes | — | — |
| DC | — | No | — |
| DE | — | No | — |
| FL | Yes | — | — |
| GA | — | No | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | Not applicable |
| GU | — | No | — |
| HI | — | No | — |
| IA | — | No | — |
| ID | — | No | — |
| IL | Yes | — | — |
| IN | — | No | — |
| KS | — | No | — |
| KY | — | No | — |
| LA | — | No | — |
| MA | — | No | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| MD | Yes | — | — |
| ME | — | No | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | Yes | — | — |
| MN | Yes | — | — |
| MO | — | No | — |
| MS | — | No | — |
| MT | — | No | — |
| NC | Yes | — | — |
| ND | — | No | — |
| NE | Yes | — | — |
| NH | — | — | Not applicable |
| NJ | — | No | — |
| NM | — | — | Not applicable |
| NV | — | No | — |
| NY | — | No | — |
| NY SRMT | — | No | — |
| OH | Yes | — | — |
| OK | Yes | — | — |
| OR | Yes | — | — |
| PA | Yes | — | — |
| RI | — | No | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| SC | Yes | — | — |
| SD | — | No | — |
| SD CRST | — | — | Not applicable |
| TN | — | No | — |
| TX | — | No | — |
| UT | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| VA | Yes | — | — |
| VT | — | No | — |
| WA | — | No | — |
| WI | Yes | — | — |
| WV | Yes | — | — |
| WY | — | — | Not applicable |

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

69. If yes, what are the pollutants and their associated contaminant reduction factors (% reduction in pollutant level resulting from cleaning, preparing, and cooking fish) assumed by your state?

Not applicable 38

| State/Tribe | Enter percent reduction in each of the following: | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|---|----------|----------|----------|--------------------|----------|----------|---------------|-----------|------------------------|----------------|
| | Chlordane | DDT | DDE | Dieldrin | Heptachlor epoxide | Mercury | Mirex | Total PCBs | Toxaphene | Other (please specify) | R_Na |
| AK | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| AL | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| AR | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 50% Reduction | — | — | — |
| AZ | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| CA | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | not used | 0 | not used | 30 | 30 | not used | — |
| CO | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| CT | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 50 | — | — | — |
| DC | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| DE | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| FL | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | 50 | not used | not used | — |
| GA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| GU | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not Applicable |

69. If yes, what are the pollutants and their associated contaminant reduction factors (% reduction in pollutant level resulting from cleaning, preparing, and cooking fish) assumed by your state? (continued)

| State/Tribe | Enter percent reduction in each of the following: | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|---|----------|----------|----------|--------------------|----------|----------|------------|-----------|------------------------|----------------|
| | Chlordane | DDT | DDE | Dieldrin | Heptachlor epoxide | Mercury | Mirex | Total PCBs | Toxaphene | Other (please specify) | R_Na |
| HI | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ID | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IL | 50 | — | — | — | — | 0 | — | 50 | — | 0 | — |
| IN | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| KS | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| KY | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| LA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MD | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | 30 | not used | not used | — |
| ME | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | 50 | not used | not used | — |
| MN | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | 50 | not used | not used | — |
| MO | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

69. If yes, what are the pollutants and their associated contaminant reduction factors (% reduction in pollutant level resulting from cleaning, preparing, and cooking fish) assumed by your state? (continued)

| State/Tribe | Enter percent reduction in each of the following: | | | | | | | | | | R_Na |
|-------------|---|----------|----------|----------|--------------------|----------|----------|------------|-----------|------------------------|----------------|
| | Chlordane | DDT | DDE | Dieldrin | Heptachlor epoxide | Mercury | Mirex | Total PCBs | Toxaphene | Other (please specify) | |
| MS | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MT | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NC | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | 50 | not used | not used | — |
| ND | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NE | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 50% | — | — | — |
| NH | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | — |
| NJ | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NM | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NV | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY SRMT | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OH | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 50 | not used | — |
| OK | not used | not used | 50 | 50 | not used | not used | not used | 50 | 50 | not used | — |
| OR | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 50 % | — | — | — |
| PA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | 50 | — | — | — |
| RI | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| SC | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | 50 | not used | 50 | — |

69. If yes, what are the pollutants and their associated contaminant reduction factors (% reduction in pollutant level resulting from cleaning, preparing, and cooking fish) assumed by your state? (continued)

| State/Tribe | Enter percent reduction in each of the following: | | | | | | | | | | R_Na |
|-------------|---|--|--|--|--|----------|----------|--|--|---|----------------|
| | Chlordane | DDT | DDE | Dieldrin | Heptachlor epoxide | Mercury | Mirex | Total PCBs | Toxaphene | Other (please specify) | |
| SD | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| SD CRST | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| TN | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| TX | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| UT | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| VA | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | 50 | not used | not used | — |
| VT | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WA | not used in calculation, used in risk management | not used in calculation, used in risk management | not used in calculation, used in risk management | not used in calculation, used in risk management | not used in calculation, used in risk management | not used | not used | not used in calculation, used in risk management | not used in calculation, used in risk management | Base consumption rates on fish tissue concentration but give information on how to reduce contaminant concentration by preparation and cooking. | — |
| WI | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | not used | 50 | not used | not used | — |

69. If yes, what are the pollutants and their associated contaminant reduction factors (% reduction in pollutant level resulting from cleaning, preparing, and cooking fish) assumed by your state? (continued)

| State/Tribe | Enter percent reduction in each of the following: | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---------|---|---|---|--|----------------|
| | Chlordane | DDT | DDE | Dieldrin | Heptachlor epoxide | Mercury | Mirex | Total PCBs | Toxaphene | Other (please specify) | R_Na |
| WV | 70 for Skin-off fillets, 50 for skin-on fillets | 70 for Skin-off fillets, 50 for skin-on fillets | 70 for Skin-off fillets, 50 for skin-on fillets | 70 for Skin-off fillets, 50 for skin-on fillets | 70 for Skin-off fillets, 50 for skin-on fillets | 0 | 70 for Skin-off fillets, 50 for skin-on fillets | 70 for Skin-off fillets, 50 for skin-on fillets | 70 for Skin-off fillets, 50 for skin-on fillets | Dioxin/Furans 70 for Skin-off fillets, 50 for skin-on fillets, Selenium: 0 | — |
| WY | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

70. If contaminant reduction factors are used, what is their basis?

| | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------|------------------------|-----------|
| EPA Guidance Documents | 4 | Other (please specify) | 1 |
| Great Lakes Protocol | 8 | Not applicable | 36 |
| Scientific literature review | 12 | | |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------|-----|------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| AK | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| AL | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| AR | — | — | Scientific literature review | — | — | — |
| AZ | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| CA | EPA Guidance Documents | — | Scientific literature review | — | — | — |
| CO | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| CT | — | — | Scientific literature review | — | — | — |
| DC | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| DE | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| FL | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | NC Risk Assessment Document 2006 | — |
| GA | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| GU | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| HI | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IA | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ID | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IL | — | — | Scientific literature review | — | — | — |
| IN | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| KS | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

70. If contaminant reduction factors are used, what is their basis? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|---------|---------|----------------|
| KY | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| LA | — | — | Scientific literature review | — | — | — |
| MA | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MD | EPA Guidance Documents | — | — | — | — | — |
| ME | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | — | Great Lakes Protocol | — | — | — | — |
| MN | — | Great Lakes Protocol | Scientific literature review | — | — | — |
| MO | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MS | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MT | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NC | EPA Guidance Documents | Great Lakes Protocol | — | — | — | — |
| ND | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NE | — | Great Lakes Protocol | — | — | — | — |
| NH | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NJ | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NM | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NV | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY SRMT | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OH | — | Great Lakes Protocol | — | — | — | — |
| OK | — | — | Scientific literature review | — | — | — |

70. If contaminant reduction factors are used, what is their basis? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|---------|---------|----------------|
| OR | — | — | Scientific literature review | — | — | — |
| PA | — | Great Lakes Protocol | — | — | — | — |
| RI | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| SC | — | — | Scientific literature review | — | — | — |
| SD | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| SD CRST | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| TN | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| TX | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| UT | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| VA | — | — | Scientific literature review | — | — | — |
| VT | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WA | EPA Guidance Documents | — | Scientific literature review | — | — | — |
| WI | — | Great Lakes Protocol | Scientific literature review | — | — | — |
| WV | — | Great Lakes Protocol | — | — | — | — |
| WY | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

71. How does your state evaluate health risks for fish samples contaminated with multiple chemicals with the same human health endpoints (e.g., two organochlorine pesticides)?

| | |
|--|----|
| Cumulative risk (add individual contaminant risks from each chemical together) | 7 |
| Calculate single contaminant risk based on the most conservative carcinogenic risk value | 3 |
| Either cumulative risk or single contaminant risk depending on the chemicals involved | 14 |
| Other method (please specify) | 5 |
| State does not evaluate health risks for multiple contaminants | 22 |
| Not applicable | 5 |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R04 | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|--|---|---------|---------|-----|------|
| AK | — | — | Either cumulative risk or single contaminant risk depending on the chemicals involved | — | — | — | — |
| AL | — | — | Either cumulative risk or single contaminant risk depending on the chemicals involved | — | — | — | — |
| AR | — | — | Either cumulative risk or single contaminant risk depending on the chemicals involved | — | — | — | — |
| AZ | — | Calculate single contaminant risk based on the most conservative carcinogenic risk value | — | — | — | — | — |
| CA | — | — | Either cumulative risk or single contaminant risk depending on the chemicals involved | — | — | — | — |

71. How does your state evaluate health risks for fish samples contaminated with multiple chemicals with the same human health endpoints (e.g., two organochlorine pesticides)? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R04 | R_NA |
|-------------|--|-----|---|-------------------------------|---|--|----------------|
| CO | — | — | — | — | — | State does not evaluate health risks for multiple contaminants | — |
| CT | — | — | — | — | — | State does not evaluate health risks for multiple contaminants | — |
| DC | — | — | Either cumulative risk or single contaminant risk depending on the chemicals involved | — | — | — | — |
| DE | — | — | Either cumulative risk or single contaminant risk depending on the chemicals involved | — | — | — | — |
| FL | — | — | — | Other method (please specify) | Cumulative risk for chemicals with common mechanism of carcinogenicity. (Same tumor; same site) or toxicity | — | — |
| GA | Cumulative risk (add individual contaminant risks from each chemical together) | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| GU | Cumulative risk (add individual contaminant risks from each chemical together) | — | — | — | — | — | — |

71. How does your state evaluate health risks for fish samples contaminated with multiple chemicals with the same human health endpoints (e.g., two organochlorine pesticides)? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R04 | R_NA |
|-------------|--|--|-----|-------------------------------|---|--|------|
| HI | — | — | — | Other method (please specify) | Back-calculate acceptable consumption rate based on most toxic chemical | — | — |
| IA | — | — | — | — | — | State does not evaluate health risks for multiple contaminants | — |
| ID | Cumulative risk (add individual contaminant risks from each chemical together) | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| IL | — | — | — | — | — | State does not evaluate health risks for multiple contaminants | — |
| IN | — | — | — | — | — | State does not evaluate health risks for multiple contaminants | — |
| KS | — | Calculate single contaminant risk based on the most conservative carcinogenic risk value | — | — | — | — | — |
| KY | — | — | — | — | — | State does not evaluate health risks for multiple contaminants | — |

71. How does your state evaluate health risks for fish samples contaminated with multiple chemicals with the same human health endpoints (e.g., two organochlorine pesticides)? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R04 | R_NA |
|-------------|--|--|---|---------|---------|--|----------------|
| LA | Cumulative risk (add individual contaminant risks from each chemical together) | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MA | — | — | — | — | — | State does not evaluate health risks for multiple contaminants | — |
| MD | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ME | — | — | Either cumulative risk or single contaminant risk depending on the chemicals involved | — | — | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | — | — | Either cumulative risk or single contaminant risk depending on the chemicals involved | — | — | — | — |
| MN | — | — | Either cumulative risk or single contaminant risk depending on the chemicals involved | — | — | — | — |
| MO | — | — | — | — | — | State does not evaluate health risks for multiple contaminants | — |
| MS | — | Calculate single contaminant risk based on the most conservative carcinogenic risk value | — | — | — | — | — |

71. How does your state evaluate health risks for fish samples contaminated with multiple chemicals with the same human health endpoints (e.g., two organochlorine pesticides)? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R04 | R_NA |
|-------------|--|-----|-----|-------------------------------|----------------------------|--|----------------|
| MT | — | — | — | — | — | State does not evaluate health risks for multiple contaminants | — |
| NC | — | — | — | Other method (please specify) | Has not yet been a problem | — | — |
| ND | — | — | — | — | — | State does not evaluate health risks for multiple contaminants | — |
| NE | Cumulative risk (add individual contaminant risks from each chemical together) | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NH | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NJ | — | — | — | — | — | State does not evaluate health risks for multiple contaminants | — |
| NM | — | — | — | — | — | State does not evaluate health risks for multiple contaminants | — |
| NV | — | — | — | — | — | State does not evaluate health risks for multiple contaminants | — |
| NY | Cumulative risk (add individual contaminant risks from each chemical together) | — | — | — | — | — | — |

71. How does your state evaluate health risks for fish samples contaminated with multiple chemicals with the same human health endpoints (e.g., two organochlorine pesticides)? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R04 | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|-----|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------|--|----------------|
| NY SRMT | — | — | — | — | — | State does not evaluate health risks for multiple contaminants | — |
| OH | — | — | — | — | — | State does not evaluate health risks for multiple contaminants | — |
| OK | — | — | Either cumulative risk or single contaminant risk depending on the chemicals involved | — | — | — | — |
| OR | — | — | — | — | — | State does not evaluate health risks for multiple contaminants | — |
| PA | — | — | — | — | — | State does not evaluate health risks for multiple contaminants | — |
| RI | — | — | — | — | — | State does not evaluate health risks for multiple contaminants | — |
| SC | — | — | — | Other method (please specify) | Most sensitive endpoint | — | — |
| SD | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| SD CRST | — | — | — | — | — | State does not evaluate health risks for multiple contaminants | — |

71. How does your state evaluate health risks for fish samples contaminated with multiple chemicals with the same human health endpoints (e.g., two organochlorine pesticides)? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R04 | R_NA |
|-------------|--|-----|---|-------------------------------|---|--|------|
| TN | — | — | Either cumulative risk or single contaminant risk depending on the chemicals involved | — | — | — | — |
| TX | Cumulative risk (add individual contaminant risks from each chemical together) | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| UT | — | — | — | — | — | State does not evaluate health risks for multiple contaminants | — |
| VA | — | — | Either cumulative risk or single contaminant risk depending on the chemicals involved | — | — | — | — |
| VT | — | — | Either cumulative risk or single contaminant risk depending on the chemicals involved | — | — | — | — |
| WA | — | — | Either cumulative risk or single contaminant risk depending on the chemicals involved | — | — | — | — |
| WI | — | — | — | Other method (please specify) | provide meal frequency advice based on the most stringent advice for multiple chemicals present | — | — |

71. How does your state evaluate health risks for fish samples contaminated with multiple chemicals with the same human health endpoints (e.g., two organochlorine pesticides)? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R04 | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|-----|-----|---------|---------|--|------|
| WV | — | — | — | — | — | State does not evaluate health risks for multiple contaminants | — |
| WY | — | — | — | — | — | State does not evaluate health risks for multiple contaminants | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

72. Regarding mercury, does your state assign different noncarcinogenic toxicity values to different populations (i.e., does the state use an RfD of 1×10^{-4} mg/kg/day for women of child-bearing age and/or children versus using an RfD of 3×10^{-4} mg/kg/day for adults in the general population)?

Yes **23**

No **28**

Not applicable **5**

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| AK | Yes | — | — |
| AL | — | No | — |
| AR | Yes | — | — |
| AZ | Yes | — | — |
| CA | Yes | — | — |
| CO | Yes | — | — |
| CT | Yes | — | — |
| DC | — | No | — |
| DE | — | No | — |
| FL | Yes | — | — |
| GA | — | No | — |
| GLIFWC | Yes | — | — |
| GU | — | — | Not applicable |
| HI | Yes | — | — |
| IA | — | No | — |
| ID | Yes | — | — |
| IL | Yes | — | — |
| IN | — | No | — |
| KS | — | No | — |
| KY | — | No | — |
| LA | Yes | — | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| MA | — | No | — |
| MD | — | No | — |
| ME | Yes | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | — | — | Not applicable |
| MN | Yes | — | — |
| MO | — | No | — |
| MS | Yes | — | — |
| MT | Yes | — | — |
| NC | Yes | — | — |
| ND | Yes | — | — |
| NE | — | No | — |
| NH | Yes | — | — |
| NJ | Yes | — | — |
| NM | — | No | — |
| NV | — | No | — |
| NY | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY SRMT | — | No | — |
| OH | — | No | — |
| OK | — | No | — |
| OR | — | No | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| PA | — | No | — |
| RI | — | No | — |
| SC | Yes | — | — |
| SD | — | No | — |
| SD CRST | — | No | — |
| TN | — | No | — |
| TX | — | No | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| UT | — | No | — |
| VA | — | No | — |
| VT | Yes | — | — |
| WA | — | No | — |
| WI | Yes | — | — |
| WV | — | No | — |
| WY | — | — | Not applicable |

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

73. What is the mercury toxicity value (i.e., RfD) used for each of the following populations?

Number of states using each value for different populations:

| RfD | Adults in the general population | Women of childbearing age or nursing mothers | Children |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|----------|
| 7×10^{-5} mg/kg/day | | 2 | 1 |
| 7.5×10^{-5} mg/kg/day | | 1 | 1 |
| 1×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | 20 | 39 | 37 |
| 2×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | 1 | | |
| 3×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | 24 | 4 | 4 |
| 3.3×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 3.4×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | 1 | | |
| 4×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | | 1 | 1 |
| Not applicable | 6 | 7 | 10 |

| State/Tribe | Adults in general population | Women of childbearing age or nursing mothers | Children | Not applicable |
|-------------|---|---|---|----------------|
| AK | Have not yet established RfD for this population | 4×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | 4×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | — |
| AL | 3.3×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | 3.3×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | 3.3×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | — |
| AR | 3×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | 1×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | 1×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | — |
| AZ | 3×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | 1×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | 1×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | — |
| CA | 3×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | 1×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | 1×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | — |
| CO | 3×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | 7.5×10^{-5} mg/kg/day | 7.5×10^{-5} mg/kg/day | — |
| CT | 3×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | 1×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | Not applicable | — |
| DC | Would use 1×10^{-4} mg/kg/day if necessary | Would use 1×10^{-4} mg/kg/day if necessary | Would use 1×10^{-4} mg/kg/day if necessary | — |
| DE | 1×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | 1×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | 1×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | — |
| FL | 3×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | 1×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | 1×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | — |
| GA | 1×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | 1×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | 1×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | — |
| GLIFWC | 3×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | 1×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | 1×10^{-4} mg/kg/day | — |

73. What is the mercury toxicity value (i.e., RfD) used for each of the following populations? (continued)

| State/Tribe | Adults in general population | Women of childbearing age or nursing mothers | Children | Not applicable |
|-------------|---|---|---|----------------|
| GU | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| HI | None. Unrestricted consumption for the general population | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| IA | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | Not applicable, Rely on statewide consumption advice for these sensitive populations. | Not applicable, Rely on statewide consumption advice for these sensitive populations. | — |
| ID | 3 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| IL | 3 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| IN | 3 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 7 x 10 ⁻⁵ mg/kg/day | 7 x 10 ⁻⁵ mg/kg/day | — |
| KS | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| KY | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| LA | 3 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| MA | 3 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 3 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 3 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| MD | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| ME | 3 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MN | 3 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| MO | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| MS | 3 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 3 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 3 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| MT | 3 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| NC | 3 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| ND | 3 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| NE | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| NH | 3 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| NJ | 3.4 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 7 x 10 ⁻⁵ mg/kg/day | Not applicable | — |
| NM | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |

73. What is the mercury toxicity value (i.e., RfD) used for each of the following populations? (continued)

| State/Tribe | Adults in general population | Women of childbearing age or nursing mothers | Children | Not applicable |
|-------------|---|---|---|----------------|
| NV | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| NY | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day, Consider multiple factors when issuing fish advisories. | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day, Consider multiple factors when issuing fish advisories. | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day, Consider multiple factors when issuing fish advisories. | — |
| NY SRMT | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | Not applicable | — |
| OH | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| OK | 2 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| OR | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| PA | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| RI | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| SC | 3 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | Same RfD as general population, but meal advice is stricter | Same RfD as general population, but meal advice is stricter | — |
| SD | 3 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 3 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 3 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| SD CRST | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| TN | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| TX | 3 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 3 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 3 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| UT | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| VA | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| VT | 3 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day, General guideline | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day, impact to fetus evaluated based on female of childbearing age | — |
| WA | Currently under review, likely to be 1x10 ⁻⁴ | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| WI | 3 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| WV | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | 1 x 10 ⁻⁴ mg/kg/day | — |
| WY | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

74. When your state receives method detection limits (MDLs) as the reportable concentration for contaminants from the laboratory, what value do you use for non-detects in your risk assessment?

| | | | |
|--------------------------|----|------------------------------|----|
| Zero | 11 | Other value (please specify) | 3 |
| Pollutant's MDL | 4 | Maximum likelihood indicator | 3 |
| Half the pollutant's MDL | 25 | Not applicable | 10 |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R04 | R_NA |
|-------------|------|-----------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|---|------------------------------|----------------|
| AK | — | — | — | — | — | Maximum likelihood indicator | — |
| AL | Zero | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| AR | — | — | Half the pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — |
| AZ | — | — | — | — | — | Maximum likelihood indicator | — |
| CA | Zero | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| CO | — | Pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — | — |
| CT | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| DC | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| DE | Zero | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| FL | — | — | — | Other value (please specify) | Either zero or 1/2 MDL based on likelihood pollutant is present | — | — |
| GA | — | Pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | never had a value below detection for mercury | — | Not applicable |
| GU | — | — | Half the pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — |
| HI | — | — | Half the pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — |
| IA | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ID | Zero | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| IL | — | — | Half the pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — |
| IN | — | — | Half the pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — |

74. When your state receives method detection limits (MDLs) as the reportable concentration for contaminants from the laboratory, what value do you use for non-detects in your risk assessment? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R04 | R_NA |
|-------------|------|-----|--------------------------|------------------------------|--|------------------------------|----------------|
| KS | — | — | — | — | — | Maximum likelihood indicator | — |
| KY | — | — | Half the pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — |
| LA | — | — | Half the pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — |
| MA | — | — | Half the pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — |
| MD | Zero | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| ME | — | — | Half the pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | Zero | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MN | — | — | Half the pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — |
| MO | — | — | Half the pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — |
| MS | Zero | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MT | Zero | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NC | Zero | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| ND | — | — | Half the pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — |
| NE | Zero | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NH | — | — | Half the pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — |
| NJ | — | — | Half the pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — |
| NM | — | — | Half the pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — |
| NV | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY | — | — | — | Other value (please specify) | Zero or half MDL, depending on professional judgment | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | — | Half the pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — |
| OH | — | — | Half the pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — |
| OK | — | — | Half the pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — |
| OR | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

74. When your state receives method detection limits (MDLs) as the reportable concentration for contaminants from the laboratory, what value do you use for non-detects in your risk assessment? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R_Other | Specify | R04 | R_NA |
|-------------|------|-----------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----|----------------|
| PA | Zero | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| RI | — | — | Half the pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — |
| SC | — | — | Half the pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — |
| SD | — | — | Half the pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — |
| SD CRST | — | Pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — | — |
| TN | — | — | Half the pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — |
| TX | — | — | Half the pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — |
| UT | — | — | — | Other value (please specify) | MDL of pollutant and data qualifier | — | — |
| VA | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| VT | — | — | Half the pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — |
| WA | — | — | Half the pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — |
| WI | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WV | — | Pollutant's MDL | — | — | — | — | — |
| WY | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

75. Does your state screen for lead in its fish tissue samples?Yes **24**No **32**

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| AK | Yes | — |
| AL | — | No |
| AR | Yes | — |
| AZ | Yes | — |
| CA | — | No |
| CO | — | No |
| CT | Yes | — |
| DC | Yes | — |
| DE | — | No |
| FL | — | No |
| GA | Yes | — |
| GLIFWC | — | No |
| GU | Yes | — |
| HI | Yes | — |
| IA | Yes | — |
| ID | — | No |
| IL | — | No |
| IN | Yes | — |
| KS | Yes | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| KY | Yes | — |
| LA | — | No |
| MA | — | No |
| MD | — | No |
| ME | Yes | — |
| ME ABM | — | No |
| MI | — | No |
| MN | — | No |
| MO | Yes | — |
| MS | Yes | — |
| MT | — | No |
| NC | Yes | — |
| ND | — | No |
| NE | Yes | — |
| NH | — | No |
| NJ | — | No |
| NM | — | No |
| NV | — | No |
| NY | Yes | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| NY SRMT | — | No |
| OH | Yes | — |
| OK | Yes | — |
| OR | — | No |
| PA | Yes | — |
| RI | — | No |
| SC | — | No |
| SD | — | No |
| SD CRST | — | No |
| TN | Yes | — |
| TX | Yes | — |
| UT | — | No |
| VA | Yes | — |
| VT | — | No |
| WA | — | No |
| WI | — | No |
| WV | — | No |
| WY | — | No |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME ABM = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

76. What assessment method do you use for lead since lead does not currently have an associated reference dose in IRIS? (Please specify assessment method used or "Not applicable" if this question doesn't apply.)

| | | | |
|--|-----------|----------------|-----------|
| EPA Integrated Exposure Uptake Biokinetic Model for Lead in Children (IEUBK) | 7 | None | 2 |
| Other | 10 | Not applicable | 37 |

| State/Tribe | Response | R_NA |
|-------------|--|----------------|
| AK | — | Not applicable |
| AL | — | Not applicable |
| AR | Screen for the level present | — |
| AZ | — | Not applicable |
| CA | — | Not applicable |
| CO | — | Not applicable |
| CT | — | Not applicable |
| DC | — | Not applicable |
| DE | — | Not applicable |
| FL | — | Not applicable |
| GA | working on approach using back calculations from EPA's child lead model | — |
| GLIFWC | — | Not applicable |
| GU | IEUBK Modeling | — |
| HI | EPA uptake biokinetic model | — |
| IA | State-specific level (i.e., level of concern). | — |
| ID | — | Not applicable |
| IL | — | Not applicable |
| IN | Although we analyze for lead, we do not have a set assessment method for fish consumption. | — |
| KS | None. We have issued advisories with respect to lead in crayfish, freshwater mussels, and clams based high concentrations found in these types of organisms. | — |
| KY | — | Not applicable |
| LA | ATSDR (oysters-shellfish program) | — |

76. What assessment method do you use for lead since lead does not currently have an associated reference dose in IRIS? (Please specify assessment method used or "Not applicable" if this question doesn't apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | Response | R_NA |
|-------------|---|----------------|
| MA | IEUBK, standard state risk assessment | — |
| MD | — | Not applicable |
| ME | IEUBK model, lead fish intake for child causing 75% chance of blood lead >10ug/dL | — |
| ME ABM | — | Not Applicable |
| MI | — | Not applicable |
| MN | — | Not applicable |
| MO | Integrated Exposure Uptake Biokinetic Model for Lead (IEUBK model) | — |
| MS | 1.0 ppm in tissue | — |
| MT | — | Not applicable |
| NC | Compare to background | — |
| ND | — | Not applicable |
| NE | — | Not applicable |
| NH | — | Not applicable |
| NJ | — | Not applicable |
| NM | — | Not applicable |
| NV | — | Not applicable |
| NY | Lead data infrequently provided, have modeled blood lead impact. | — |
| NY SRMT | — | Not applicable |
| OH | FDA total tolerable daily intake | — |
| OK | IEUBK Lead Model using site specific soil data. | — |
| OR | — | not applicable |
| PA | — | Not applicable |
| RI | — | Not applicable |
| SC | — | Not applicable |
| SD | — | Not applicable |
| SD CRST | — | Not applicable |

76. What assessment method do you use for lead since lead does not currently have an associated reference dose in IRIS? (Please specify assessment method used or "Not applicable" if this question doesn't apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | Response | R_NA |
|-------------|--|----------------|
| TN | High levels of lead cause concern, but no assessment method given | — |
| TX | IEUBK model used to assess changes in blood lead concentrations at various fish tissue lead levels. | — |
| UT | We use the provisional tolerable total intake level for lead from the FDA as well as current literature. | — |
| VA | — | not applicable |
| VT | — | Not applicable |
| WA | — | Not applicable |
| WI | — | Not applicable |
| WV | — | Not applicable |
| WY | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

77. Are health risks being assessed in your state for target groups of people whose culinary habits may differ from the customs of the majority of Americans regarding meal preparation and consumption?

Yes **24**

No **32**

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| AK | Yes | — |
| AL | — | No |
| AS | — | No |
| AZ | Yes | — |
| CA | — | No |
| CO | — | No |
| CT | Yes | — |
| DC | — | No |
| DE | Yes | — |
| FL | — | No |
| GA | — | No |
| GLIFWC | Yes | — |
| GU | Yes | — |
| HI | Yes | — |
| IA | — | No |
| ID | — | No |
| IL | — | No |
| IN | — | No |
| KS | Yes | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| KY | — | No |
| LA | Yes | — |
| MA | — | No |
| MD | — | No |
| ME | — | No |
| ME ABM | Yes | — |
| MI | Yes | — |
| MN | Yes | — |
| MO | — | No |
| MS | Yes | — |
| MT | Yes | — |
| NC | Yes | — |
| ND | — | No |
| NE | — | No |
| NH | — | No |
| NJ | — | No |
| NM | — | No |
| NV | — | No |
| NY | Yes | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| NY SRMT | — | No |
| OH | — | No |
| OK | Yes | — |
| OR | Yes | — |
| PA | — | No |
| RI | — | No |
| SC | Yes | — |
| SD | — | No |
| SD CRST | Yes | — |
| TN | — | No |
| TX | — | No |
| UT | — | No |
| VA | — | No |
| VT | Yes | — |
| WA | Yes | — |
| WI | Yes | — |
| WV | — | No |
| WY | Yes | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

78. Has your state identified the primary waterbodies fished by these target population(s)?Yes **23**No **24**Not applicable **9**

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| AK | Yes | — | — |
| AL | — | — | Not applicable |
| AR | Yes | — | — |
| AZ | Yes | — | — |
| CA | — | No | — |
| CO | — | — | Not applicable |
| CT | Yes | — | — |
| DC | — | — | Not applicable |
| DE | Yes | — | — |
| FL | — | — | Not applicable |
| GA | — | No | — |
| GLIFWC | Yes | — | — |
| GU | — | No | — |
| HI | Yes | — | — |
| IA | — | No | — |
| ID | — | — | Not applicable |
| IL | — | No | — |
| IN | — | No | — |
| KS | — | No | — |
| KY | — | No | — |
| LA | Yes | — | — |
| MA | Yes | — | — |
| MD | — | No | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| ME | — | No | — |
| ME ABM | Yes | — | — |
| MI | Yes | — | — |
| MN | Yes | — | — |
| MO | — | No | — |
| MS | Yes | — | — |
| MT | Yes | — | — |
| NC | Yes | — | — |
| ND | — | No | — |
| NE | — | No | — |
| NH | — | — | Not applicable |
| NJ | — | No | — |
| NM | — | — | Not applicable |
| NV | — | No | — |
| NY | Yes | — | — |
| NY SRMT | Yes | — | — |
| OH | — | No | — |
| OK | Yes | — | — |
| OR | Yes | — | — |
| PA | — | — | Not applicable |
| RI | — | No | — |
| SC | — | No | — |
| SD | — | No | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| SD CRST | Yes | — | — |
| TN | — | No | — |
| TX | — | — | Not applicable |
| UT | — | No | — |
| VA | — | No | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| VT | Yes | — | — |
| WA | Yes | — | — |
| WI | — | No | — |
| WV | — | No | — |
| WY | Yes | — | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

79. Has your state made efforts to identify the fish species and the sizes of fish consumed by these target populations?

Yes **25**
 No **24**
 Not applicable **7**

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| AK | Yes | — | — |
| AL | — | — | Not applicable |
| AR | Yes | — | — |
| AZ | — | No | — |
| CA | Yes | — | — |
| CO | — | No | — |
| CT | Yes | — | — |
| DC | — | — | Not applicable |
| DE | Yes | — | — |
| FL | — | — | Not applicable |
| GA | — | No | — |
| GLIFWC | Yes | — | — |
| GU | Yes | — | — |
| HI | Yes | — | — |
| IA | — | No | — |
| ID | — | — | Not applicable |
| IL | — | No | — |
| IN | — | No | — |
| KS | — | No | — |
| KY | — | No | — |
| LA | Yes | — | — |
| MA | Yes | — | — |
| MD | — | No | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| ME | — | No | — |
| ME ABM | Yes | — | — |
| MI | Yes | — | — |
| MN | Yes | — | — |
| MO | — | No | — |
| MS | Yes | — | — |
| MT | — | No | — |
| NC | Yes | — | — |
| ND | — | No | — |
| NE | — | No | — |
| NH | — | No | — |
| NJ | — | No | — |
| NM | — | — | Not applicable |
| NV | — | No | — |
| NY | Yes | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | No | — |
| OH | — | No | — |
| OK | Yes | — | — |
| OR | Yes | — | — |
| PA | — | — | Not applicable |
| RI | Yes | — | — |
| SC | Yes | — | — |
| SD | — | No | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| SD CRST | Yes | — | — |
| TN | — | No | — |
| TX | — | — | Not applicable |
| UT | — | No | — |
| VA | — | No | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| VT | Yes | — | — |
| WA | Yes | — | — |
| WI | Yes | — | — |
| WV | — | No | — |
| WY | Yes | — | — |

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

80. If yes, has your state used any of the following procedures to obtain information from these target populations? (Please check all that apply).

| | | | |
|--|-----------|--|-----------|
| Local fish consumption surveys (creel surveys) | 23 | Behavioral risk surveillance surveys funded by the Centers for Disease Control | 4 |
| Fishing license surveys | 5 | Not applicable | 30 |
| Anecdotal information from populations of interest | 18 | | |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_NA |
|-------------|--|-----|--|--|----------------|
| AK | Local fish consumption surveys (creel surveys) | — | Anecdotal information from populations of interest | — | — |
| AL | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| AR | Local fish consumption surveys (creel surveys) | — | Anecdotal information from populations of interest | — | — |
| AZ | Local fish consumption surveys (creel surveys) | — | — | Behavioral risk surveillance surveys funded by the Centers for Disease Control | — |
| CA | Local fish consumption surveys (creel surveys) | — | Anecdotal information from populations of interest | Behavioral risk surveillance surveys funded by the Centers for Disease Control | — |
| CO | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| CT | Local fish consumption surveys (creel surveys) | — | — | — | — |
| DC | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| DE | Local fish consumption surveys (creel surveys) | — | — | — | — |
| FL | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| GA | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| GLIFWC | Local fish consumption surveys (creel surveys) | — | — | — | — |
| GU | Local fish consumption surveys (creel surveys) | — | Anecdotal information from populations of interest | — | — |

80. If yes, has your state used any of the following procedures to obtain information from these target populations? (Please check all that apply). (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_NA |
|-------------|--|-------------------------|--|--|----------------|
| HI | Local fish consumption surveys (creel surveys) | Fishing license surveys | Anecdotal information from populations of interest | — | — |
| IA | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ID | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IL | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IN | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| KS | — | — | Anecdotal information from populations of interest | — | — |
| KY | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| LA | Local fish consumption surveys (creel surveys) | Fishing license surveys | — | — | — |
| MA | Local fish consumption surveys (creel surveys) | — | Anecdotal information from populations of interest | — | — |
| MD | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ME | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ME ABM | Local fish consumption surveys (creel surveys) | — | Anecdotal information from populations of interest | — | — |
| MI | Local fish consumption surveys (creel surveys) | — | Anecdotal information from populations of interest | — | — |
| MN | Local fish consumption surveys (creel surveys) | — | Anecdotal information from populations of interest | Behavioral risk surveillance surveys funded by the Centers for Disease Control | — |
| MO | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MS | Local fish consumption surveys (creel surveys) | — | Anecdotal information from populations of interest | — | — |
| MT | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NC | Local fish consumption surveys (creel surveys) | — | — | — | — |
| ND | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

80. If yes, has your state used any of the following procedures to obtain information from these target populations? (Please check all that apply). (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_NA |
|-------------|--|-------------------------|--|-----|----------------|
| NE | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NH | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NJ | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NM | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NV | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY | Local fish consumption surveys (creel surveys) | Fishing license surveys | — | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OH | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OK | — | — | Anecdotal information from populations of interest | — | — |
| OR | Local fish consumption surveys (creel surveys) | — | Anecdotal information from populations of interest | — | — |
| PA | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| RI | — | — | Anecdotal information from populations of interest | — | — |
| SC | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| SD | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| SD CRST | Local fish consumption surveys (creel surveys) | Fishing license surveys | Anecdotal information from populations of interest | — | — |
| TN | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| TX | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| UT | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| VA | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| VT | Local fish consumption surveys (creel surveys) | — | Anecdotal information from populations of interest | — | — |

80. If yes, has your state used any of the following procedures to obtain information from these target populations? (Please check all that apply). (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_NA |
|-------------|--|-------------------------|--|--|----------------|
| WA | Local fish consumption surveys (creel surveys) | — | Anecdotal information from populations of interest | Behavioral risk surveillance surveys funded by the Centers for Disease Control | — |
| WI | Local fish consumption surveys (creel surveys) | — | Anecdotal information from populations of interest | — | — |
| WV | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WY | Local fish consumption surveys (creel surveys) | Fishing license surveys | — | — | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

81. Has your state altered its monitoring approach to address the needs of these target populations?

Yes **18**
 No **29**
 Not applicable **9**

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| AK | Yes | — | — |
| AL | — | — | Not applicable |
| AR | Yes | — | — |
| AZ | Yes | — | — |
| CA | — | No | — |
| CO | — | — | Not applicable |
| CT | Yes | — | — |
| DC | — | — | Not applicable |
| DE | Yes | — | — |
| FL | — | — | Not applicable |
| GA | — | No | — |
| GLIFWC | Yes | — | — |
| GU | — | — | Not applicable |
| HI | Yes | — | — |
| IA | — | No | — |
| ID | — | — | Not applicable |
| IL | — | No | — |
| IN | — | No | — |
| KS | — | No | — |
| KY | — | No | — |
| LA | — | No | — |
| MA | — | No | — |
| MD | — | No | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| ME | Yes | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | No | — |
| MI | Yes | — | — |
| MN | Yes | — | — |
| MO | — | No | — |
| MS | Yes | — | — |
| MT | — | No | — |
| NC | Yes | — | — |
| ND | — | No | — |
| NE | — | No | — |
| NH | — | No | — |
| NJ | — | No | — |
| NM | — | No | — |
| NV | — | No | — |
| NY | Yes | — | — |
| NY SRMT | Yes | — | — |
| OH | — | No | — |
| OK | Yes | — | — |
| OR | — | No | — |
| PA | — | — | Not applicable |
| RI | — | No | — |
| SC | — | No | — |
| SD | — | No | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| SD CRST | Yes | — | — |
| TN | — | No | — |
| TX | — | — | Not applicable |
| UT | — | No | — |
| VA | — | No | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| VT | — | No | — |
| WA | Yes | — | — |
| WI | Yes | — | — |
| WV | — | No | — |
| WY | — | — | Not applicable |

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

82. If your state has altered its monitoring approach to address the needs of these target populations, what actions have been taken? (Please check all that apply.)

State has added stations in waterbodies where the targeted populations frequently fish **12**

Other actions (please specify) **7**

Not applicable **36**

State has targeted species consumed by the targeted populations for residue analyses **16**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|--|--|--------------------------------|--|----------------|
| AK | — | State has targeted species consumed by the targeted populations for residue analyses | Other actions (please specify) | State has made site visits, discussed concerns with the population and performed voluntary human biomonitoring when requested by individuals or the community. | — |
| AL | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| AR | — | — | Other actions (please specify) | More samples taken where target populations fish | — |
| AZ | State has added stations in waterbodies where the targeted populations frequently fish | State has targeted species consumed by the targeted populations for residue analyses | — | — | — |
| CA | — | — | Other actions (please specify) | Target populations are a factor in determining sampling sites | — |
| CO | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| CT | — | State has targeted species consumed by the targeted populations for residue analyses | — | — | — |
| DC | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| DE | State has added stations in waterbodies where the targeted populations frequently fish | State has targeted species consumed by the targeted populations for residue analyses | — | — | — |
| FL | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| GA | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

**82. If your state has altered its monitoring approach to address the needs of these target populations, what actions have been taken?
(Please check all that apply.) (continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|--|--|--------------------------------|--|----------------|
| GLIFWC | State has added stations in waterbodies where the targeted populations frequently fish | State has targeted species consumed by the targeted populations for residue analyses | — | — | — |
| GU | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| HI | — | State has targeted species consumed by the targeted populations for residue analyses | Other actions (please specify) | whole fish are analyzed | — |
| IA | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ID | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IL | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IN | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| KS | — | — | — | We have asked EPA to continue support of whole fish analyses based on the assumption that certain segments of the population are likely consuming portions of fish other than fillets. EPA does not wish to continue the support of whole fish analyses. | Not applicable |
| KY | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| LA | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MA | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MD | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ME | State has added stations in waterbodies where the targeted populations frequently fish | — | — | — | — |
| ME ABM | State has added stations in waterbodies where the targeted populations frequently fish | State has targeted species consumed by the targeted populations for residue analyses | — | — | — |

**82. If your state has altered its monitoring approach to address the needs of these target populations, what actions have been taken?
(Please check all that apply.) (continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|--|--|--------------------------------|--|----------------|
| MI | — | — | Other actions (please specify) | Targeting updated information on Catfish and white bass from the Detroit River | — |
| MN | State has added stations in waterbodies where the targeted populations frequently fish | State has targeted species consumed by the targeted populations for residue analyses | — | — | — |
| MO | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MS | — | State has targeted species consumed by the targeted populations for residue analyses | — | — | — |
| MT | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NC | State has added stations in waterbodies where the targeted populations frequently fish | State has targeted species consumed by the targeted populations for residue analyses | — | — | — |
| ND | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NE | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NH | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NJ | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NM | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NV | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY | State has added stations in waterbodies where the targeted populations frequently fish | State has targeted species consumed by the targeted populations for residue analyses | — | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | State has targeted species consumed by the targeted populations for residue analyses | — | — | Not applicable |
| OH | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OK | State has added stations in waterbodies where the targeted populations frequently fish | State has targeted species consumed by the targeted populations for residue analyses | — | — | — |

**82. If your state has altered its monitoring approach to address the needs of these target populations, what actions have been taken?
(Please check all that apply.) (continued)**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|--|--|--------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| OR | — | — | Other actions (please specify) | — | Not applicable |
| PA | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| RI | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| SC | State has added stations in waterbodies where the targeted populations frequently fish | — | — | — | — |
| SD | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| SD CRST | State has added stations in waterbodies where the targeted populations frequently fish | State has targeted species consumed by the targeted populations for residue analyses | — | — | — |
| TN | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| TX | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| UT | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| VA | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| VT | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WA | — | State has targeted species consumed by the targeted populations for residue analyses | — | — | — |
| WI | State has added stations in waterbodies where the targeted populations frequently fish | State has targeted species consumed by the targeted populations for residue analyses | Other actions (please specify) | Special advisories | — |
| WV | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WY | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

83. If your state is not currently addressing the concerns of populations with a perceived higher risk, is there a plan to do so in the future?

Yes **21**
 No **17**
 Not applicable **18**

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| AK | — | — | Not applicable |
| AL | — | No | — |
| AR | — | — | Not applicable |
| AZ | Yes | — | — |
| CA | — | No | — |
| CO | — | No | — |
| CT | — | — | Not applicable |
| DC | — | — | Not applicable |
| DE | — | — | Not applicable |
| FL | — | No | — |
| GA | Yes | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | Not applicable |
| GU | Yes | — | — |
| HI | Yes | — | — |
| IA | Yes | — | — |
| ID | — | No | — |
| IL | — | No | — |
| IN | Yes | — | — |
| KS | — | — | Not applicable |
| KY | Yes | — | — |
| LA | — | — | Not applicable |
| MA | Yes | — | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| MD | — | — | Not applicable |
| ME | — | No | — |
| ME ABM | Yes | — | — |
| MI | — | No | — |
| MN | — | — | Not applicable |
| MO | Yes | — | — |
| MS | — | — | Not applicable |
| MT | Yes | — | — |
| NC | — | — | Not applicable |
| ND | — | No | — |
| NE | Yes | — | — |
| NH | Yes | — | — |
| NJ | Yes | — | — |
| NM | — | No | — |
| NV | Yes | — | — |
| NY | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY SRMT | Yes | — | — |
| OH | — | No | — |
| OK | — | — | Not applicable |
| OR | — | No | — |
| PA | Yes | — | — |
| RI | Yes | — | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| SC | — | — | Not applicable |
| SD | — | No | — |
| SD CRST | Yes | — | — |
| TN | — | No | — |
| TX | — | No | — |
| UT | — | No | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| VA | — | No | — |
| VT | — | — | Not applicable |
| WA | — | — | Not applicable |
| WI | — | — | Not applicable |
| WV | Yes | — | — |
| WY | Yes | — | — |

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

84. Who prepares risk assessments on behalf of your state or tribal fish advisory program? (Please check all that apply.)

| | | | |
|---|----|------------------------|---|
| State or Tribal Environmental Agency/Department | 19 | University | 1 |
| State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | 33 | Other (please specify) | 9 |
| Consultant | 2 | Not applicable | 3 |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R04 | R05 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---|---|-----|-----|------------------------|--|------|
| AK | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | State Environmental AND Health Departments work together. The state has established a Scientific Advisory Committee to assist with the development of the fish consumption recommendations. This committee is comprised of Alaskan scientists and physicians with expertise in contaminants, human health and nutrition. | — |
| AL | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| AR | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| AZ | State or Tribal Environmental Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| CA | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | OEHHA in Cal/EPA | — |
| CO | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| CT | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| DC | State or Tribal Environmental Agency/Department | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |

84. Who prepares risk assessments on behalf of your state or tribal fish advisory program? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R04 | R05 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---|---|------------|------------|------------------------|--|----------------|
| DE | State or Tribal Environmental Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| FL | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Health issues advisories in cooperation with Fisheries, Environmental, and Agriculture (commercial food safety) agencies | — |
| GA | State or Tribal Environmental Agency/Department | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | primary work done by Environmental Agency by board certified toxicologist, but significant input from Health Agency | — |
| GLIFWC | State or Tribal Environmental Agency/Department | — | Consultant | University | — | — | — |
| GU | State or Tribal Environmental Agency/Department | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | USEPA Region IX | — |
| HI | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| IA | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| ID | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| IL | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| IN | State or Tribal Environmental Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| KS | State or Tribal Environmental Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | We prepare our own risk assessments. | Not applicable |
| KY | State or Tribal Environmental Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| LA | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |

84. Who prepares risk assessments on behalf of your state or tribal fish advisory program? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R04 | R05 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---|---|------------|-----|------------------------|--|----------------|
| MA | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| MD | State or Tribal Environmental Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| ME | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | Consultant | — | — | — | — |
| MI | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| MN | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| MO | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| MS | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | Task force of environmental, health and fisheries agencies | — |
| MT | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| NC | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| ND | State or Tribal Environmental Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NE | State or Tribal Environmental Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NH | State or Tribal Environmental Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NJ | State or Tribal Environmental Agency/Department | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | Other (please specify) | Interagency Risk Assessment Group | — |
| NM | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NV | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

84. Who prepares risk assessments on behalf of your state or tribal fish advisory program? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R04 | R05 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---|---|-----|-----|------------------------|---|------|
| NY | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| NY SRMT | State or Tribal Environmental Agency/Department | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| OH | State or Tribal Environmental Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| OK | State or Tribal Environmental Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| OR | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| PA | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | Other (please specify) | Thru MOU w/ Interagency FCA Technical & Policy Workgroups | — |
| RI | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| SC | State or Tribal Environmental Agency/Department | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| SD | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| SD CRST | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | EPA | — |
| TN | State or Tribal Environmental Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| TX | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| UT | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| VA | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| VT | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |

84. Who prepares risk assessments on behalf of your state or tribal fish advisory program? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R04 | R05 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|---|-----|-----|------------------------|--|------|
| WA | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| WI | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| WV | — | — | — | — | Other (please specify) | A committee represented by environmental, health, and fisheries agencies | — |
| WY | — | State or Tribal Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

85. Does your state or tribe have written procedures for evaluating the health risks associated with consumption of chemically contaminated fish?

Yes **42**

No **14**

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| AK | Yes | |
| AL | | No |
| AR | Yes | |
| AZ | Yes | |
| CA | Yes | |
| CO | Yes | |
| CT | Yes | |
| DC | Yes | |
| DE | Yes | |
| FL | | No |
| GA | Yes | |
| GLIFWC | Yes | |
| GU | Yes | |
| HI | Yes | |
| IA | Yes | |
| ID | Yes | |
| IL | Yes | |
| IN | Yes | |
| KS | Yes | |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| KY | Yes | |
| LA | Yes | |
| MA | | No |
| MD | Yes | |
| ME | | No |
| ME ABM | | No |
| MI | Yes | |
| MN | Yes | |
| MO | Yes | |
| MS | Yes | |
| MT | | No |
| NC | Yes | |
| ND | Yes | |
| NE | Yes | |
| NH | Yes | |
| NJ | Yes | |
| NM | | No |
| NV | | No |
| NY | | No |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| NY SRMT | | No |
| OH | Yes | |
| OK | Yes | |
| OR | Yes | |
| PA | Yes | |
| RI | Yes | |
| SC | Yes | |
| SD | | No |
| SD CRST | | No |
| TN | Yes | |
| TX | Yes | |
| UT | Yes | |
| VA | Yes | |
| VT | | No |
| WA | Yes | |
| WI | Yes | |
| WV | Yes | |
| WY | | No |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

86. Does your state or tribe have a group or committee that over sees the fish advisory program/processes?

Yes 45

No 11

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| AK | Yes | — | — |
| AL | — | No | — |
| AR | Yes | — | — |
| AZ | Yes | — | — |
| CA | — | No | — |
| CO | Yes | — | — |
| CT | — | No | — |
| DC | Yes | — | — |
| DE | Yes | — | — |
| FL | Yes | — | — |
| GA | Yes | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | No | — |
| GU | Yes | — | — |
| HI | — | No | — |
| IA | Yes | — | — |
| ID | Yes | — | — |
| IL | Yes | — | — |
| IN | Yes | — | — |
| KS | — | No | — |
| KY | Yes | — | — |
| LA | Yes | — | — |
| MA | Yes | — | — |
| MD | Yes | — | — |
| ME | Yes | — | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| ME ABM | Yes | — | — |
| MI | Yes | — | — |
| MN | Yes | — | — |
| MO | Yes | — | — |
| MS | Yes | — | — |
| MT | Yes | — | — |
| NC | — | No | — |
| ND | Yes | — | — |
| NE | Yes | — | — |
| NH | Yes | — | — |
| NJ | Yes | — | — |
| NM | Yes | — | — |
| NV | Yes | — | — |
| NY | Yes | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | No | — |
| OH | Yes | — | — |
| OK | Yes | — | — |
| OR | Yes | — | — |
| PA | Yes | — | — |
| RI | — | No | — |
| SC | Yes | — | — |
| SD | Yes | — | — |
| SD CRST | Yes | — | — |
| TN | Yes | — | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| TX | — | No | — |
| UT | Yes | — | — |
| VA | Yes | — | — |
| VT | — | No | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| WA | Yes | — | — |
| WI | Yes | — | — |
| WV | Yes | — | — |
| WY | Yes | — | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

87. If the answer to question 86 is yes, what professional disciplines are represented on that committee? (Please check all that apply.)

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|
| Toxicology/epidemiology | 42 | Analytical chemist | 22 |
| Fisheries | 42 | Risk communication | 32 |
| Water pollution assessment/control | 35 | Other | 12 |
| Hazardous waste management | 7 | Not applicable | 11 |

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------|
| AK | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | — | — | Analytical chemist | Risk communication | Other disciplines (please specify) | University Researchers, Medical Professionals (physicians) | — |
| AL | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| AR | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | — | — | — | — | Other disciplines (please specify) | Department of Environmental Quality | — |
| AZ | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | — | Risk communication | — | — | — |
| CA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| CO | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | — | Risk communication | — | — | — |
| CT | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| DC | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | Analytical chemist | — | — | — | — |
| DE | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | Hazardous waste management | Analytical chemist | Risk communication | — | — | — |

**87. If the answer to question 86 is yes, what professional disciplines are represented on that committee? (Please check all that apply.)
(continued)**

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| FL | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | Analytical chemist | Risk communication | Other disciplines (please specify) | Risk communication and analytical chemistry participate when needed. | — |
| GA | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | Analytical chemist | Risk communication | — | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| GU | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | — | Hazardous waste management | Analytical chemist | Risk communication | Other disciplines (please specify) | — | — |
| HI | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IA | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | Hazardous waste management | — | Risk communication | — | — | — |
| ID | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | Analytical chemist | Risk communication | — | — | — |
| IL | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | Analytical chemist | Risk communication | Other disciplines (please specify) | Food safety | — |
| IN | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| KS | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

**87. If the answer to question 86 is yes, what professional disciplines are represented on that committee? (Please check all that apply.)
(continued)**

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------|
| KY | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| LA | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MA | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | Hazardous waste management | Analytical chemist | Risk communication | — | — | — |
| MD | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | Analytical chemist | Risk communication | — | — | — |
| ME | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | — | Risk communication | Other disciplines (please specify) | Public health risk managers | — |
| ME ABM | Toxicology/ epidemiology | — | — | — | Analytical chemist | Risk communication | — | — | — |
| MI | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | — | Risk communication | — | — | — |
| MN | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | Analytical chemist | Risk communication | — | — | — |
| MO | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | — | Risk communication | — | — | — |
| MS | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | — | — | — | — | — |

**87. If the answer to question 86 is yes, what professional disciplines are represented on that committee? (Please check all that apply.)
(continued)**

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| MT | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | — | Risk communication | — | — | — |
| NC | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ND | — | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | — | Risk communication | Other disciplines (please specify) | Physician | — |
| NE | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | — | — | Other disciplines (please specify) | County health officials, private citizen, member of state wildlife federation | — |
| NH | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | — | — | Analytical chemist | Risk communication | — | — | — |
| NJ | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | Analytical chemist | Risk communication | — | — | — |
| NM | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NV | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | Analytical chemist | — | — | — | — |
| NY | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | — | — | Analytical chemist | Risk communication | Other disciplines (please specify) | biology, health education | — |
| NY SRMT | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OH | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | Hazardous waste management | Analytical chemist | Risk communication | — | — | — |

**87. If the answer to question 86 is yes, what professional disciplines are represented on that committee? (Please check all that apply.)
(continued)**

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| OK | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | — | — | Analytical chemist | Risk communication | — | — | — |
| OR | Toxicology/ epidemiology | — | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | Analytical chemist | Risk communication | Other disciplines (please specify) | Environmental Health Specialist | — |
| PA | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | Analytical chemist | — | — | — | — |
| RI | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| SC | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | Hazardous waste management | Analytical chemist | Risk communication | — | — | — |
| SD | — | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | — | — | Other disciplines (please specify) | Health Dept Administration | — |
| SD CRST | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | — | Risk communication | Other disciplines (please specify) | ELECTED OFFICIALS | — |
| TN | — | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| TX | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| UT | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | Hazardous waste management | Analytical chemist | Risk communication | — | — | — |
| VA | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | — | Risk communication | — | — | — |

**87. If the answer to question 86 is yes, what professional disciplines are represented on that committee? (Please check all that apply.)
(continued)**

| State/ Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|-----------|---|-----|-----|-----------------------|---------|---------|----------------|
| VT | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WA | Toxicology/ epidemiology | — | — | — | — | Risk communication | — | — | — |
| WI | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| WV | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | Water pollution assessment/ control | — | — | Risk communication | — | — | — |
| WY | Toxicology/ epidemiology | Fisheries | — | — | — | Risk communication | — | — | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

88. Who in your state or tribe makes the ultimate risk management decision to issue, modify, or rescind fish advisories?

| | | | |
|---|-----------|--|-----------|
| Head of Environmental Agency/Department | 10 | Governor's Office or Tribal Chief's/President's Office | 3 |
| Head of Public Health Agency/Department | 25 | Other official (please specify by title) | 17 |
| Head of Fisheries Agency/Department | 1 | | |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify |
|-------------|---|---|-----|-----|--|---|
| AK | — | — | — | — | Other official (please specify by title) | State environmental AND health departments jointly agree |
| AL | — | Head of Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — |
| AR | — | Head of Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — |
| AZ | — | — | — | — | Other official (please specify by title) | The decision is a joint decision of the Environmental, Health and Game and Fish Departments |
| CA | — | — | — | — | Other official (please specify by title) | Director of OEHHA a public health office |
| CO | — | — | — | — | Other official (please specify by title) | Environmental Toxicology Section Chief in Dept. of Public Health and Environment |
| CT | — | Head of Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — |
| DC | Head of Environmental Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| DE | — | — | — | — | Other official (please specify by title) | Joint decision by Environmental Secretary and Public Health Secretary |
| FL | — | Head of Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — |

88. Who in your state or tribe makes the ultimate risk management decision to issue, modify, or rescind fish advisories? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify |
|-------------|---|---|-------------------------------------|-----|--|---|
| GA | Head of Environmental Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | — | Other official (please specify by title) | Collaborative process with tribal leaders & scientists |
| GU | — | Head of Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | Is based on data that is provided by the Environmental Agency (GEPA) |
| HI | — | Head of Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — |
| IA | — | — | Head of Fisheries Agency/Department | — | — | — |
| ID | — | — | — | — | Other official (please specify by title) | The Dept of Health and Welfare's Environmental Health Section makes the call |
| IL | — | Head of Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — |
| IN | — | Head of Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — |
| KS | — | — | — | — | Other official (please specify by title) | The manager of the fish tissue contaminant program. Advisories are reviewed by agency heads, but only for language and political concerns related to language used i.e. no direct or indirect blame attributed to polluting industries. |

88. Who in your state or tribe makes the ultimate risk management decision to issue, modify, or rescind fish advisories? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify |
|-------------|---|---|-----|--|--|---|
| KY | — | Head of Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — |
| LA | — | Head of Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — |
| MA | — | Head of Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — |
| MD | Head of Environmental Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| ME | — | Head of Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | Governor's Office or Tribal Chief's/President's Office | — | — |
| MI | — | — | — | — | Other official (please specify by title) | Director of the Division of Environmental and Occupational Epidemiology |
| MN | — | Head of Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — |
| MO | — | Head of Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — |
| MS | Head of Environmental Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| MT | — | Head of Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — |
| NC | — | Head of Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — |
| ND | Head of Environmental Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| NE | — | Head of Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — |

88. Who in your state or tribe makes the ultimate risk management decision to issue, modify, or rescind fish advisories? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify |
|-------------|---|---|-----|--|--|--|
| NH | Head of Environmental Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| NJ | Head of Environmental Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | Joint decision by Department of Environmental Protection, Department of Health and Senior Services and Department of Agriculture |
| NM | — | — | — | — | Other official (please specify by title) | Environment Dept., Game and Fish Dept., and Health Dept. technical staff |
| NV | — | — | — | — | Other official (please specify by title) | Head of Envr. AND Head of Health dept. |
| NY | — | Head of Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | — | — | Governor's Office or Tribal Chief's/President's Office | — | — |
| OH | Head of Environmental Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| OK | Head of Environmental Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| OR | — | — | — | — | Other official (please specify by title) | Office of Environmental Public Health Administrator |
| PA | — | — | — | — | Other official (please specify by title) | Chair of Interagency FCA Policy Workgroup |
| RI | — | Head of Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — |

88. Who in your state or tribe makes the ultimate risk management decision to issue, modify, or rescind fish advisories? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R_Other | Specify |
|-------------|---|---|-----|--|--|--|
| SC | — | — | — | — | Other official (please specify by title) | SCDHEC= Health and Environmental Control |
| SD | — | — | — | — | Other official (please specify by title) | fish consumption advisory group |
| SD CRST | — | — | — | Governor's Office or Tribal Chief's/President's Office | — | — |
| TN | Head of Environmental Agency/Department | — | — | — | — | — |
| TX | — | Head of Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — |
| UT | — | Head of Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — |
| VA | — | Head of Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — |
| VT | — | Head of Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — |
| WA | — | — | — | — | Other official (please specify by title) | Toxicologist |
| WI | — | Head of Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — |
| WV | — | Head of Public Health Agency/Department | — | — | — | — |
| WY | — | — | — | — | Other official (please specify by title) | Joint - Game & Fish, Dept. of Health |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

89. How often does your Agency revise the fish consumption advisory listings and release the information to the public? (Please specify all that apply.)

Annually; contingent on completion of analytical work **15**
Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) **35**

Other schedules (please specify) **9**
Not applicable **1**

| State/Tribe | R01a | R02 | R_Other | Other Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---|--|----------------------------------|---|------|
| AK | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| AL | Annually; contingent on completion of analytical work | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| AR | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| AZ | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| CA | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | Other schedules (please specify) | Once per year in March and as needed | — |
| CO | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| CT | 25-May | — | — | — | — |
| DC | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| DE | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| FL | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | Other schedules (please specify) | Attempt to publish booklet annually; updated information on web site quarterly, special press release for possible immediate health risk. | — |
| GA | March 1 or April 1 | — | — | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | Other schedules (please specify) | As funding is available | — |

89. How often does your Agency revise the fish consumption advisory listings and release the information to the public? (Please specify all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01a | R02 | R_Other | Other Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|---|------|
| GU | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | Other schedules (please specify) | Based on a five (5) year review | — |
| HI | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| IA | — | — | Other schedules (please specify) | annually, released upon receipt of data from EPA R7 | — |
| ID | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| IL | 2-Jan | — | — | — | — |
| IN | between Mar - May | — | — | — | — |
| KS | — | — | — | — | — |
| KY | Annually | — | — | — | — |
| LA | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| MA | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| MD | — | — | Other schedules (please specify) | The goal is to monitor, and update advisories annually. Updates are typically posted within May and June. | — |
| ME | — | — | Other schedules (please specify) | 3-5 Yrs. | — |
| ME ABM | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| MI | Annually; released on Spring | — | — | — | — |
| MN | May | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| MO | 1 March | — | — | — | — |
| MS | Annually; July 1 | — | — | — | — |

89. How often does your Agency revise the fish consumption advisory listings and release the information to the public? (Please specify all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01a | R02 | R_Other | Other Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---|--|---------|----------------------------------|------|
| MT | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| NC | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| ND | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| NE | 30-Nov | — | — | — | — |
| NH | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| NJ | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| NM | — | — | — | — | — |
| NV | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| NY | generally in the spring, and occasionally at other times when data indicates need for timely new advice | — | — | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| OH | 1-Mar | — | — | — | — |
| OK | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| OR | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| PA | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | as needed, but at least annually | — |
| RI | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |

89. How often does your Agency revise the fish consumption advisory listings and release the information to the public? (Please specify all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01a | R02 | R_Other | Other Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|--|--|----------------------------------|---|----------------|
| SC | Annually; between March 15 and April 1 | — | — | — | — |
| SD | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| SD CRST | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| TN | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | Other schedules (please specify) | 305(b) report | — |
| TX | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| UT | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| VA | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| VT | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| WA | — | Whenever data become available (on an as-needed basis) | — | — | — |
| WI | — | — | Other schedules (please specify) | Usually annually except in extenuating situations. Also, emergency release of information and advisory if there is an immediate health risk | — |
| WV | Annually; December | — | — | — | — |
| WY | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

90. Where can the public obtain copies of your agency's printed advisory materials? (Please check all that apply.)

| | | | |
|--|-----------|--------------------------------|-----------|
| Local public health departments | 30 | Tourist offices | 7 |
| State public health departments | 46 | State fisheries offices | 45 |
| Other State agencies | 34 | Tribal organizations | 14 |
| Doctors' offices | 19 | Town halls | 4 |
| Local businesses (e.g., hair styling salons) | 2 | Law enforcement officers | 3 |
| Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops) | 35 | State Internet site | 45 |
| WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics | 32 | Other sources (please specify) | 24 |
| Welfare offices | 1 | Not applicable | 1 |
| Organizations (e.g., sporting or women's clubs) | 7 | | |

| State/Tribe | Response |
|-------------|--|
| AK | Local public health departments, State public health departments, Doctors' offices, WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, State fisheries offices, Tribal organizations, State Internet site |
| AL | Local public health departments, State public health departments, Other State agencies, Doctors' offices, WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, Tourist offices, State fisheries offices, State Internet site |
| AR | Local public health departments, State public health departments, Other State agencies, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, State fisheries offices, State Internet site, Other sources (please specify), Pharmacies and some local health units |
| AZ | Other State agencies, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), State fisheries offices, State Internet site |
| CA | Local public health departments, State public health departments, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, State fisheries offices, State Internet site, Other sources (please specify), By request to OEHHA |
| CO | State public health departments, State fisheries offices, State Internet site |
| CT | Local public health departments, State public health departments, Doctors' offices, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, State fisheries offices, Town halls, State Internet site, Other sources (please specify), Refugee associations |
| DC | Local public health departments, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), State fisheries offices, Law enforcement officers, State Internet site |
| DE | State public health departments, Other State agencies, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, State fisheries offices, State Internet site |
| FL | Local public health departments, State public health departments, Other State agencies, State fisheries offices, State Internet site |

90. Where can the public obtain copies of your agency's printed advisory materials? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | Response |
|-------------|--|
| GA | Local public health departments, State public health departments, Other State agencies, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), Organizations (e.g., sporting or women's clubs), State fisheries offices, State Internet site, Other sources (please specify), Regional Department offices |
| GLIFWC | Local public health departments, Doctors' offices, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, Tribal organizations, Other sources (please specify), GLIFWC website, tribal harvest registration stations, tribal health clinics |
| GU | State public health departments, Other State agencies, State fisheries offices, Other sources (please specify), GEPA website, Fish-Shellfish monitoring program site |
| HI | State public health departments, Doctors' offices, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, Town halls |
| IA | State public health departments, Other State agencies, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), State fisheries offices, Other sources (please specify), State Section 305(b) water quality report. |
| ID | State public health departments, WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, State Internet site |
| IL | State public health departments, Other State agencies, Doctors' offices, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, State fisheries offices, State Internet site, Other sources (please specify), State regional offices, state fair booths |
| IN | State public health departments, Doctors' offices, State Internet site |
| KS | Local public health departments, State public health departments, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), State fisheries offices |
| KY | State public health departments, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), State fisheries offices, State Internet site |
| LA | Local public health departments, State public health departments, Other State agencies, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), State fisheries offices, State Internet site |
| MA | Local public health departments, State public health departments, Other State agencies, Doctors' offices, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, State fisheries offices, Town halls, State Internet site |
| MD | Local public health departments, State public health departments, Other State agencies, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, Organizations (e.g., sporting or women's clubs), State fisheries offices, State Internet site, Other sources (please specify), Fishing License Guide-book |
| ME | State public health departments, Other State agencies, Doctors' offices, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, State fisheries offices, Tribal organizations, State Internet site |
| ME ABM | Local public health departments, Doctors' offices, WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, State fisheries offices, Tribal organizations, State Internet site |
| MI | State Internet site |
| MN | Local public health departments, State public health departments, Other State agencies, Doctors' offices, Local businesses (e.g., hair styling salons), Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, Organizations (e.g., sporting or women's clubs), Tourist offices, State fisheries offices, Tribal organizations, Town halls, Law enforcement officers, State Internet site |

90. Where can the public obtain copies of your agency's printed advisory materials? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | Response |
|-------------|--|
| MO | Local public health departments, State public health departments, Other State agencies, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, State fisheries offices, State Internet site |
| MS | Local public health departments, State public health departments, Other State agencies, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, State fisheries offices, State Internet site, Other sources (please specify), Churches, schools, libraries |
| MT | State public health departments, Other State agencies, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, State fisheries offices, State Internet site, Other sources (please specify), website |
| NC | Local public health departments, State public health departments, Other State agencies, Doctors' offices, Local businesses (e.g., hair styling salons), Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, Welfare offices, Organizations (e.g., sporting or women's clubs), Tourist offices, State fisheries offices, Tribal organizations, Law enforcement officers, State Internet site, Other sources (please specify), Mailings, internet, public meetings, newsletters, newspapers, tv news, PSAs |
| ND | Local public health departments, State public health departments, State fisheries offices, State Internet site, Other sources (please specify), fishing license vendors |
| NE | State public health departments, Other State agencies, Doctors' offices, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), State fisheries offices |
| NH | Local public health departments, State public health departments, Other State agencies, Doctors' offices, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, Organizations (e.g., sporting or women's clubs), State fisheries offices, State Internet site, Other sources (please specify), Environmental non-profit organizations |
| NJ | Local public health departments, State public health departments, Doctors' offices, WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, State Internet site |
| NM | Other State agencies, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), State fisheries offices, State Internet site, Other sources (please specify), annual fishing proclamation |
| NV | Local public health departments, State public health departments, State fisheries offices, Other sources (please specify), NDOW Website |
| NY | Local public health departments, State public health departments, Other State agencies, Tourist offices, State fisheries offices, Tribal organizations, State Internet site |
| NY SRMT | Tribal organizations, Other sources (please specify), Tribal agency (Environment Division) |
| OH | Local public health departments, State public health departments, Other State agencies, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, State fisheries offices, State Internet site |
| OK | Local public health departments, State public health departments, Other State agencies, Doctors' offices, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, Tourist offices, State fisheries offices, Tribal organizations, State Internet site |
| OR | State public health departments, Other State agencies, Doctors' offices, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, State fisheries offices, Tribal organizations, State Internet site, Other sources (please specify), OR Fish and Wildlife Fish Regulations |

90. Where can the public obtain copies of your agency's printed advisory materials? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | Response |
|-------------|---|
| PA | State public health departments, Other State agencies, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), State fisheries offices, State Internet site |
| RI | State public health departments, State Internet site |
| SC | Local public health departments, State public health departments, Other State agencies, Doctors' offices, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, Organizations (e.g., sporting or women's clubs), State fisheries offices, Tribal organizations, State Internet site, Other sources (please specify), State Parks, National Park, Conservation Organizations |
| SD | State public health departments, State fisheries offices, State Internet site |
| SD CRST | WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, Tribal organizations |
| TN | Other State agencies, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), State fisheries offices, State Internet site, Other sources (please specify), 305(b) report |
| TX | Local public health departments, State public health departments, Other State agencies, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, State fisheries offices, State Internet site, Other sources (please specify), other state agency publications |
| UT | State public health departments, Other State agencies, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, Organizations (e.g., sporting or women's clubs), State fisheries offices, Other sources (please specify), Entrance to fishing areas, website |
| VA | Local public health departments, State public health departments, Other State agencies, State fisheries offices, State Internet site, http://www.vdh.virginia.gov/epidemiology/DEE/PublicHealthToxicology/Advisories/index.htm |
| VT | State public health departments, Other State agencies, Doctors' offices, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, State fisheries offices, State Internet site |
| WA | Local public health departments, State public health departments, WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, Tribal organizations, State Internet site, Other sources (please specify), Sport Fishing Rules pamphlet |
| WI | Local public health departments, State public health departments, Other State agencies, WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, Tourist offices, State fisheries offices, Tribal organizations, State Internet site, Other sources (please specify), State parks |
| WV | State public health departments, Other State agencies, Businesses that issue fishing licenses (e.g., bait and tackle shops), WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) clinics, Tourist offices, State fisheries offices, State Internet site |
| WY | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

91. How are your Agency's fish advisories communicated to the public? (Please check all that apply.)

| | | | |
|---|----|---|----|
| Mailed to public upon request | 45 | Posters in public places (libraries, town halls, etc) | 9 |
| Press releases distributed to media sources | 49 | Annual fishing regulations booklet | 44 |
| Targeted newspaper stories | 33 | Generic statewide listing booklet separate from fishing regulations | 13 |
| Published articles in ethnic newspapers | 7 | Printed pamphlets or fact sheets | 42 |
| Videos for ethnic groups | 3 | Information presented at public meetings | 34 |
| Radio announcements | 17 | Publication of articles in state medical journal | 5 |
| Television announcements | 8 | Publication of articles in agency annual monitoring report | 9 |
| Radio/television talk shows | 12 | Publication of information in state 305(b) report | 32 |
| Internet site | 52 | Flyers distributed with trout and salmon stamps | 1 |
| Agency telephone information service (i.e., hotlines) | 22 | GIS maps posted for tribal members | 3 |
| Agency magazine | 8 | Other methods (please specify) | 16 |
| Posted signs (at boat launches, stream access points, public docks, etc.) | 24 | Not applicable | 1 |
| Posted information where fishing licenses issued | 13 | | |

| State/Tribe | Response |
|-------------|---|
| AK | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Radio announcements, Radio/television talk shows, Internet site, Posted signs (at boat launches, stream access points, public docks, etc.), Posters in public places (libraries, town halls, etc), Annual fishing regulations booklet, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings, Other methods (please specify), Department of Health publishes the guidance in Epidemiology Bulletins, |
| AL | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Radio announcements, Television announcements, Radio/television talk shows, Internet site, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings |
| AR | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Radio announcements, Internet site, Agency telephone information service (i.e., hotlines), Posted signs (at boat launches, stream access points, public docks, etc.), Posted information where fishing licenses issued, Annual fishing regulations booklet, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings, Other methods (please specify), Presentations, AR Game & Fish Commission Fishing Guidebook, and ATSDR Documents |
| AZ | Press releases distributed to media sources, Internet site, Annual fishing regulations booklet, Publication of information in state 305(b) report |
| CA | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Published articles in ethnic newspapers, Radio/television talk shows, Internet site, Posted signs (at boat launches, stream access points, public docks, etc.), Annual fishing regulations booklet, Generic statewide listing booklet separate from fishing regulations, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings |

91. How are your Agency's fish advisories communicated to the public? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | Response |
|-------------|--|
| CO | Press releases distributed to media sources, Internet site, Posted signs (at boat launches, stream access points, public docks, etc.) |
| CT | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Videos for ethnic groups, Internet site, Posted signs (at boat launches, stream access points, public docks, etc.), Posted information where fishing licenses issued, Annual fishing regulations booklet, Generic statewide listing booklet separate from fishing regulations, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings |
| DC | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Internet site, Annual fishing regulations booklet, Publication of information in state 305(b) report |
| DE | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Radio announcements, Television announcements, Internet site, Annual fishing regulations booklet, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings, Publication of articles in agency annual monitoring report, Publication of information in state 305(b) report |
| FL | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Internet site, Agency telephone information service (i.e., hotlines), Annual fishing regulations booklet, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings, Publication of information in state 305(b) report |
| GA | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Internet site, Agency telephone information service (i.e., hotlines), Posted signs (at boat launches, stream access points, public docks, etc.), Annual fishing regulations booklet, Generic statewide listing booklet separate from fishing regulations, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings, Publication of articles in agency annual monitoring report, Publication of information in state 305(b) report, posting of signs is used in a very limited way, only at major superfund sites |
| GLIFWC | Mailed to public upon request, Published articles in ethnic newspapers, Internet site, Agency telephone information service (i.e., hotlines), Posted information where fishing licenses issued, Posters in public places (libraries, town halls, etc), Information presented at public meetings, Publication of articles in agency annual monitoring report, GIS maps posted for tribal members |
| GU | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Radio announcements, Television announcements, Radio/television talk shows, Internet site, Agency telephone information service (i.e., hotlines), Posted signs (at boat launches, stream access points, public docks, etc.), Information presented at public meetings, Publication of articles in agency annual monitoring report, Publication of information in state 305(b) report |
| HI | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Radio announcements, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets |
| IA | Press releases distributed to media sources, Internet site, Annual fishing regulations booklet, Publication of information in state 305(b) report |
| ID | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Internet site, Agency telephone information service (i.e., hotlines), Posted signs (at boat launches, stream access points, public docks, etc.), Annual fishing regulations booklet, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings, Other methods (please specify), Idaho Fish and Game regulation booklet |
| IL | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Internet site, Agency telephone information service (i.e., hotlines), Annual fishing regulations booklet, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Publication of information in state 305(b) report, Flyers distributed with trout and salmon stamps, Other methods (please specify), State fair booths |

91. How are your Agency's fish advisories communicated to the public? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | Response |
|-------------|--|
| IN | Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Radio/television talk shows, Internet site, Annual fishing regulations booklet, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings |
| KS | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Internet site, Posted signs (at boat launches, stream access points, public docks, etc.), Annual fishing regulations booklet, Publication of information in state 305(b) report |
| KY | Press releases distributed to media sources, Internet site, Posted signs (at boat launches, stream access points, public docks, etc.), Annual fishing regulations booklet, Publication of information in state 305(b) report |
| LA | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Internet site, Posted signs (at boat launches, stream access points, public docks, etc.), Annual fishing regulations booklet, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings, Publication of information in state 305(b) report |
| MA | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Published articles in ethnic newspapers, Internet site, Posted information where fishing licenses issued, Posters in public places (libraries, town halls, etc), Annual fishing regulations booklet, Generic statewide listing booklet separate from fishing regulations, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings, Publication of articles in state medical journal, Publication of articles in agency annual monitoring report, Publication of information in state 305(b) report, Other methods (please specify), Hospitals |
| MD | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Internet site, Posted signs (at boat launches, stream access points, public docks, etc.), Annual fishing regulations booklet, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings, Publication of information in state 305(b) report, Other methods (please specify), An active GIS map is being developed. A kml file will be available for download from MDE's website. NOTE: not yet available. |
| ME | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Radio/television talk shows, Internet site, Agency telephone information service (i.e., hotlines), Agency magazine, Annual fishing regulations booklet, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Publication of articles in agency annual monitoring report, Other methods (please specify), brochures to mail to couples at marriage |
| ME ABM | Published articles in ethnic newspapers, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Other methods (please specify), Provided with Each Fishing License that is Issued. |
| MI | Mailed to public upon request, Internet site, Agency telephone information service (i.e., hotlines), Generic statewide listing booklet separate from fishing regulations, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings, Community-based stakeholders |
| MN | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Published articles in ethnic newspapers, Videos for ethnic groups, Radio announcements, Television announcements, Radio/television talk shows, Internet site, Agency telephone information service (i.e., hotlines), Posters in public places (libraries, town halls, etc), Annual fishing regulations booklet, Generic statewide listing booklet separate from fishing regulations, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings, Publication of articles in state medical journal, Publication of information in state 305(b) report |
| MO | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Radio announcements, Radio/television talk shows, Internet site, Agency telephone information service (i.e., hotlines), Agency magazine, Posted signs (at boat launches, stream access points, public docks, etc.), Annual fishing regulations booklet, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Publication of articles in state medical journal, Other methods (please specify), We also frequently hand out the advisory along with other general chemical exposure risks (like radon, lead, carbon monoxide, etc.) at various events we attend such as fairs and conferences held by various organizations. |

91. How are your Agency's fish advisories communicated to the public? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | Response |
|-------------|---|
| MS | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Radio announcements, Television announcements, Radio/television talk shows, Internet site, Agency telephone information service (i.e., hotlines), Posted signs (at boat launches, stream access points, public docks, etc.), Posted information where fishing licenses issued, Posters in public places (libraries, town halls, etc), Annual fishing regulations booklet, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings, Publication of information in state 305(b) report, Other methods (please specify), Letters, brochures and posters sent to churches, letters and posters to fish markets and grocery stores. |
| MT | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Internet site, Annual fishing regulations booklet, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets |
| NC | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Published articles in ethnic newspapers, Radio announcements, Television announcements, Radio/television talk shows, Internet site, Agency magazine, Posted information where fishing licenses issued, Posters in public places (libraries, town halls, etc), Annual fishing regulations booklet, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings, Publication of articles in state medical journal, Publication of information in state 305(b) report, Other methods (please specify), OB-GYN, Family Physician, Pediatrician Assoc. newsletters, county WIC clinics, Indian Affairs, Cooperative Extension |
| ND | Mailed to public upon request, Internet site, Posted information where fishing licenses issued, Annual fishing regulations booklet, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets |
| NE | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Radio announcements, Internet site, Annual fishing regulations booklet, Publication of information in state 305(b) report |
| NH | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Internet site, Agency telephone information service (i.e., hotlines), Agency magazine, Posted information where fishing licenses issued, Annual fishing regulations booklet, Generic statewide listing booklet separate from fishing regulations, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings, Publication of articles in agency annual monitoring report, Publication of information in state 305(b) report, Other methods (please specify), Publish articles in NH DHHS newsletter and NH Public Health Assoc. Newsletter |
| NJ | Mailed to public upon request, Internet site, Annual fishing regulations booklet |
| NM | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Internet site, Agency telephone information service (i.e., hotlines), Annual fishing regulations booklet, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Publication of information in state 305(b) report |
| NV | Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Radio announcements, Television announcements, Internet site, Agency magazine, Posted signs (at boat launches, stream access points, public docks, etc.), Annual fishing regulations booklet |
| NY | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Radio announcements, Internet site, Agency telephone information service (i.e., hotlines), Agency magazine, Annual fishing regulations booklet, Generic statewide listing booklet separate from fishing regulations, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings, Other methods (please specify), direct contact with anglers |
| NY SRMT | Targeted newspaper stories, Published articles in ethnic newspapers, Videos for ethnic groups, Internet site, Posted information where fishing licenses issued, Posters in public places (libraries, town halls, etc), Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Publication of information in state 305(b) report |

91. How are your Agency's fish advisories communicated to the public? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | Response |
|-------------|--|
| OH | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Internet site, Agency telephone information service (i.e., hotlines), Annual fishing regulations booklet, Generic statewide listing booklet separate from fishing regulations, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings, Publication of information in state 305(b) report, Other methods (please specify), developing GIS web application to be released early 2005 |
| OK | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Radio/television talk shows, Internet site, Agency telephone information service (i.e., hotlines), Posted information where fishing licenses issued, Posters in public places (libraries, town halls, etc), Generic statewide listing booklet separate from fishing regulations, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings |
| OR | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Radio announcements, Television announcements, Internet site, Agency telephone information service (i.e., hotlines), Posted signs (at boat launches, stream access points, public docks, etc.), Annual fishing regulations booklet, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings, Publication of information in state 305(b) report |
| PA | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Internet site, Posted information where fishing licenses issued, Annual fishing regulations booklet, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Publication of information in state 305(b) report |
| RI | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Internet site, Agency telephone information service (i.e., hotlines), Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings, Other methods (please specify), website |
| SC | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Radio announcements, Internet site, Agency telephone information service (i.e., hotlines), Posted signs (at boat launches, stream access points, public docks, etc.), Annual fishing regulations booklet, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings, Publication of articles in agency annual monitoring report, Publication of information in state 305(b) report |
| SD | Press releases distributed to media sources, Internet site, Posted signs (at boat launches, stream access points, public docks, etc.), Annual fishing regulations booklet, Publication of information in state 305(b) report |
| SD CRST | Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Radio announcements, Agency telephone information service (i.e., hotlines), Posted signs (at boat launches, stream access points, public docks, etc.), Posted information where fishing licenses issued, Posters in public places (libraries, town halls, etc), Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings |
| TN | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Internet site, Posted signs (at boat launches, stream access points, public docks, etc.), Annual fishing regulations booklet, Information presented at public meetings, Publication of information in state 305(b) report |
| TX | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Internet site, Annual fishing regulations booklet, Generic statewide listing booklet separate from fishing regulations, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings, Publication of information in state 305(b) report, Other methods (please specify), At fishing shows |
| UT | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Internet site, Posted signs (at boat launches, stream access points, public docks, etc.), Posted information where fishing licenses issued, Annual fishing regulations booklet, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings, Publication of information in state 305(b) report |

91. How are your Agency's fish advisories communicated to the public? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | Response |
|-------------|--|
| VA | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Radio announcements, Internet site, Posted signs (at boat launches, stream access points, public docks, etc.), Annual fishing regulations booklet, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings, Publication of information in state 305(b) report |
| VT | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Internet site, Agency magazine, Annual fishing regulations booklet, Generic statewide listing booklet separate from fishing regulations, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Publication of information in state 305(b) report |
| WA | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Internet site, Agency telephone information service (i.e., hotlines), Posted signs (at boat launches, stream access points, public docks, etc.), Annual fishing regulations booklet, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings |
| WI | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Targeted newspaper stories, Radio/television talk shows, Internet site, Agency magazine, Posted signs (at boat launches, stream access points, public docks, etc.), Annual fishing regulations booklet, Generic statewide listing booklet separate from fishing regulations, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings, Publication of articles in state medical journal, Publication of articles in agency annual monitoring report, Publication of information in state 305(b) report |
| WV | Mailed to public upon request, Press releases distributed to media sources, Internet site, Annual fishing regulations booklet, Printed pamphlets or fact sheets, Information presented at public meetings, Publication of information in state 305(b) report |
| WY | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

92. Does your state or tribal fish advisory distribution plan specifically target some populations to receive advisory information?Yes **45**No **11**

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| AK | Yes | — |
| AL | — | No |
| AR | Yes | — |
| AZ | Yes | — |
| CA | Yes | — |
| CO | Yes | — |
| CT | Yes | — |
| DC | — | No |
| DE | Yes | — |
| FL | Yes | — |
| GA | Yes | — |
| GLIFWC | Yes | — |
| GU | — | No |
| HI | Yes | — |
| IA | Yes | — |
| ID | Yes | — |
| IL | Yes | — |
| IN | Yes | — |
| KS | Yes | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| KY | — | No |
| LA | Yes | — |
| MA | Yes | — |
| MD | Yes | — |
| ME | Yes | — |
| ME ABM | Yes | — |
| MI | Yes | — |
| MN | Yes | — |
| MO | Yes | — |
| MS | Yes | — |
| MT | Yes | — |
| NC | Yes | — |
| ND | — | No |
| NE | Yes | — |
| NH | Yes | — |
| NJ | Yes | — |
| NM | — | No |
| NV | — | No |
| NY | Yes | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| NY SRMT | — | No |
| OH | Yes | — |
| OK | Yes | — |
| OR | Yes | — |
| PA | — | No |
| RI | Yes | — |
| SC | Yes | — |
| SD | — | No |
| SD CRST | Yes | — |
| TN | Yes | — |
| TX | Yes | — |
| UT | Yes | — |
| VA | — | No |
| VT | Yes | — |
| WA | Yes | — |
| WI | Yes | — |
| WV | Yes | — |
| WY | Yes | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME ABM = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

93. If yes, please identify all populations that are targeted.

| | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| Sport fishers | 32 | New parents | 9 |
| Subsistence fishers | 19 | Tourists | 6 |
| Specific racial/ethnic groups (please specify) | 13 | Members of the general population | 26 |
| Women of child-bearing age | 34 | Others (please specify) | 7 |
| Pregnant or nursing women | 37 | Not applicable | 10 |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03a | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R08 | R_Other | Other Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| AK | Sport fishers | Subsistence fishers | — | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | New parents | — | Members of the general population | Others (please specify) | WIC enrollees | — |
| AL | Sport fishers | — | — | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | — | Tourists | Members of the general population | — | — | — |
| AR | Sport fishers | Subsistence fishers | — | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | — | Tourists | Members of the general population | Others (please specify) | Children | — |
| AZ | Sport fishers | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| CA | Sport fishers | Subsistence fishers | — | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | — | — | Members of the general population | — | — | — |
| CO | Sport fishers | — | — | — | — | — | — | Members of the general population | — | — | — |
| CT | Sport fishers | Subsistence fishers | Southeast Asian | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| DC | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| DE | Sport fishers | Subsistence fishers | — | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | — | — | — | — | — | — |

93. If yes, please identify all populations that are targeted. (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03a | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R08 | R_Other | Other Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-----|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| FL | — | — | — | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| GA | Sport fishers | — | — | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| GLIFWC | — | Subsistence fishers | Select Ojibwa tribes in WI, MI, MN | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| GU | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| HI | — | — | Chinese, Filipino, Laotian, Japanese | — | Pregnant or nursing women | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| IA | Sport fishers | — | — | — | — | — | — | Members of the general population | — | — | — |
| ID | Sport fishers | — | — | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | — | — | Members of the general population | — | — | — |
| IL | — | — | — | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| IN | Sport fishers | — | — | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | — | — | Members of the general population | Others (please specify) | Children | — |
| KS | Sport fishers | Subsistence fishers | — | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | New parents | — | Members of the general population | — | — | — |

93. If yes, please identify all populations that are targeted. (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03a | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R08 | R_Other | Other Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-----|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|---|----------------|
| KY | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| LA | Sport fishers | Subsistence fishers | — | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | — | — | Members of the general population | — | — | — |
| MA | — | — | — | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | — | — | — | Others (please specify) | Family practice physicians, ob/gyn's, clinics | — |
| MD | Sport fishers | Subsistence fishers | — | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | — | — | Members of the general population | — | — | — |
| ME | — | — | — | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | New parents | — | Members of the general population | — | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | Native Americans | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MI | Sport fishers | — | — | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| MN | Sport fishers | Subsistence fishers | SE Asians | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | — | — | Members of the general population | — | — | — |
| MO | — | — | — | — | Pregnant or nursing women | New parents | — | Members of the general population | Others (please specify) | children | — |
| MS | Sport fishers | Subsistence fishers | African Americans | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | — | — | Members of the general population | — | — | — |

93. If yes, please identify all populations that are targeted. (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03a | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R08 | R_Other | Other Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|---|----------------|
| MT | Sport fishers | Subsistence fishers | — | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NC | Sport fishers | Subsistence fishers | Specific racial/ethnic groups | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | New parents | Tourists | Members of the general population | Others (please specify) | Indian Affairs; Other - Children, commercial fishermen, Hispanic, WIC | — |
| ND | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NE | Sport fishers | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NH | Sport fishers | — | — | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | New parents | Tourists | Members of the general population | — | — | — |
| NJ | Sport fishers | — | Hispanic, Latino and Asian groups | — | Pregnant or nursing women | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NM | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NV | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY | Sport fishers | Subsistence fishers | African Americans, Native Americans | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | — | Tourists | Members of the general population | — | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

93. If yes, please identify all populations that are targeted. (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03a | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R08 | R_Other | Other Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---------------|---------------------|--|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------------|----------------|
| OH | Sport fishers | — | — | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | New parents | — | — | — | — | — |
| OK | Sport fishers | — | — | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | — | Tourists | Members of the general population | — | — | — |
| OR | Sport fishers | Subsistence fishers | Specific racial/ethnic groups - outreach to Asian community centers and African Americans, Tribes and tribal staff | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | New parents | — | Members of the general population | — | — | — |
| PA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| RI | — | — | Spanish-speakers, Southeast Asians | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| SC | — | Subsistence fishers | — | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | — | — | Members of the general population | — | — | — |
| SD | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| SD CRST | — | Subsistence fishers | Specific racial/ethnic groups | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | — | — | Members of the general population | — | — | — |

93. If yes, please identify all populations that are targeted. (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03a | R04 | R05 | R06 | R07 | R08 | R_Other | Other Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-----|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|---|----------------|
| TN | Sport fishers | — | — | — | — | — | — | Members of the general population | — | — | — |
| TX | Sport fishers | — | — | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | — | — | Members of the general population | — | — | — |
| UT | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Others (please specify) | All who enter fishing area receive information if they want it. | — |
| VA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| VT | — | — | — | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| WA | Sport fishers | Subsistence fishers | Hispanic and Asian populations | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | New parents | — | Members of the general population | — | — | — |
| WI | Sport fishers | — | — | — | — | — | — | Members of the general population | — | — | — |
| WV | Sport fishers | Subsistence fishers | — | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| WY | — | — | — | Women of child-bearing age | Pregnant or nursing women | — | — | — | — | — | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

94. Are your state or tribal fish consumption advisories distributed to the public in languages other than English?

Yes 29

No 27

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| AK | Yes | — |
| AL | — | No |
| AR | — | No |
| AZ | Yes | — |
| CA | Yes | — |
| CO | Yes | — |
| CT | Yes | — |
| DC | Yes | — |
| DE | Yes | — |
| FL | Yes | — |
| GA | Yes | — |
| GLIFWC | Yes | — |
| GU | Yes | — |
| HI | Yes | — |
| IA | — | No |
| ID | Yes | — |
| IL | — | No |
| IN | — | No |
| KS | Yes | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| KY | — | No |
| LA | — | No |
| MA | Yes | — |
| MD | Yes | — |
| ME | — | No |
| ME ABM | — | No |
| MI | — | No |
| MN | Yes | — |
| MO | — | No |
| MS | Yes | — |
| MT | — | No |
| NC | Yes | — |
| ND | — | No |
| NE | — | No |
| NH | — | No |
| NJ | Yes | — |
| NM | — | No |
| NV | — | No |
| NY | Yes | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| NY SRMT | — | No |
| OH | Yes | — |
| OK | — | No |
| OR | Yes | — |
| PA | — | No |
| RI | Yes | — |
| SC | Yes | — |
| SD | — | No |
| SD CRST | — | No |
| TN | — | No |
| TX | — | No |
| UT | Yes | — |
| VA | — | No |
| VT | Yes | — |
| WA | Yes | — |
| WI | Yes | — |
| WV | — | No |
| WY | — | No |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME ABM = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

95. If yes, please specify all languages that apply.

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|------------|----|-------------------------|----|
| Alaskan native languages | 1 | Laotian | 7 | Tagalog | 3 |
| Cambodian | 7 | Llacano | 1 | Thai | 2 |
| Chinese | 7 | Ojibwa | 1 | Vietnamese | 8 |
| Hmong | 6 | Portuguese | 2 | Others (please specify) | 6 |
| Japanese | 3 | Russian | 5 | Not applicable | 26 |
| Korean | 5 | Spanish | 26 | | |

| State/Tribe | Response |
|-------------|--|
| AK | Alaskan native languages, Cambodian, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Laotian, Spanish, Tagalog, Vietnamese |
| AL | Not applicable |
| AR | Not applicable |
| AZ | Spanish |
| CA | Cambodian, Chinese, Korean, Laotian, Russian, Spanish, Tagalog, Vietnamese |
| CO | Spanish |
| CT | Cambodian, Hmong, Laotian, Spanish, Thai, Vietnamese |
| DC | Spanish |
| DE | Spanish |
| FL | Spanish, Others (please specify), Haitian Creole |
| GA | Spanish, Others (please specify), Only the information developed specifically for pregnant or nursing women is produced in Spanish |
| GLIFWC | Ojibwa, advisory contains mostly English with some Ojibwe words |
| GU | Others (please specify), Chamorro |
| HI | Chinese, Japanese, Laotian, Llacano, Tagalog |
| IA | Not applicable |
| ID | Spanish |
| IL | Not applicable |
| IN | Not applicable |

| State/Tribe | Response |
|-------------|--|
| KS | Cambodian, Laotian, Spanish, Vietnamese |
| KY | Not applicable |
| LA | Not applicable |
| MA | Cambodian, Chinese, Creole, Hmong, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, Vietnamese, Khmer |
| MD | Spanish |
| ME | Not applicable |
| ME ABM | Not applicable |
| MI | Not applicable |
| MN | Hmong, Spanish |
| MO | Not applicable |
| MS | Spanish |
| MT | Not applicable |
| NC | Spanish |
| ND | Not applicable |
| NE | Not applicable |
| NH | Not applicable |
| NJ | Korean, Portuguese, Spanish |
| NM | Not applicable |
| NV | Not applicable |

| State/Tribe | Response |
|-------------|--|
| NY | Spanish |
| NY SRMT | Not applicable |
| OH | Chinese, Korean, Spanish |
| OK | Not applicable |
| OR | Chinese, Hmong, Russian, Spanish, Vietnamese |
| PA | Not applicable |
| RI | Cambodian, Laotian, Spanish, Thai |
| SC | Spanish |
| SD | Not applicable |
| SD CRST | Others (please specify), we hire people to present in the Native languages |
| TN | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

| State/Tribe | Response |
|-------------|---|
| TX | Not applicable |
| UT | Spanish |
| VA | Not applicable |
| VT | Russian, Spanish, Vietnamese, Others (please specify), French, Serbo-Croatian |
| WA | Cambodian, Chinese, Hmong, Japanese, Korean, Laotian, Russian, Spanish, Vietnamese, Others (please specify), Arabic, Somalian |
| WI | Hmong, Spanish |
| WV | Not applicable |
| WY | Not applicable |

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

96. Does your state or tribe evaluate the effectiveness of the fish consumption advisories?

Yes **24**
 No **30**
 Not applicable **2**

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| AK | Yes | — | — |
| AL | Yes | — | — |
| AR | Yes | — | — |
| AZ | — | No | — |
| CA | Yes | — | — |
| CO | — | No | — |
| CT | Yes | — | — |
| DC | — | No | — |
| DE | Yes | — | — |
| FL | — | No | — |
| GA | Yes | — | — |
| GLIFWC | Yes | — | — |
| GU | — | — | Not applicable |
| HI | Yes | — | — |
| IA | — | No | — |
| ID | — | No | — |
| IL | — | No | — |
| IN | Yes | — | — |
| KS | — | No | — |
| KY | — | No | — |
| LA | Yes | — | — |
| MA | — | No | — |
| MD | Yes | — | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| ME | Yes | — | — |
| ME ABM | — | No | — |
| MI | — | No | — |
| MN | Yes | — | — |
| MO | Yes | — | — |
| MS | — | No | — |
| MT | Yes | — | — |
| NC | Yes | — | — |
| ND | — | No | — |
| NE | — | No | — |
| NH | Yes | — | — |
| NJ | — | No | — |
| NM | — | No | — |
| NV | — | No | — |
| NY | Yes | — | — |
| NY SRMT | — | No | — |
| OH | Yes | — | — |
| OK | — | No | — |
| OR | — | No | — |
| PA | — | No | — |
| RI | — | No | — |
| SC | Yes | — | — |
| SD | — | No | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| SD CRST | Yes | — | — |
| TN | — | No | — |
| TX | — | No | — |
| UT | — | No | — |
| VA | — | No | — |

| State/Tribe | Response_Y | Response_N | Response_NA |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| VT | Yes | — | — |
| WA | — | No | — |
| WI | Yes | — | — |
| WV | — | No | — |
| WY | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

97. If yes, how is their effectiveness determined? (Please check all that apply.)

| | | | |
|--|----------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| Feedback form/postcard in regulation pamphlet | 6 | Mailed questionnaires (to whom?) | 7 |
| Questions included in creel census program | 7 | Telephone surveys (of whom?) | 6 |
| Questions included in state BRFS (Behavior Risk Factor Survey) | 2 | Other methods (please specify) | 13 |
| Focus groups | 7 | Not applicable | 32 |

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---|--|-----|--------------|----------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------|---|----------------|
| AK | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other methods (please specify) | Site visits to subsistence villages, site visits during low tide for shellfish advisories | — |
| AL | Feedback form/postcard in regulation pamphlet | — | — | — | Mailed questionnaires (to whom?) | — | — | Mailed questionnaires to individuals requesting copies of the advisories | — |
| AR | Feedback form/postcard in regulation pamphlet | — | — | — | — | — | Other methods (please specify) | Informally talking with citizens | — |
| AZ | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| CA | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other methods (please specify) | Pier Questionnaire | — |
| CO | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| CT | Feedback form/postcard in regulation pamphlet | Questions included in creel census program | — | Focus groups | Mailed questionnaires (to whom?) | — | — | Questionnaire to OB/Gyn Offices | — |
| DC | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

97. If yes, how is their effectiveness determined? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---|--|-----|--------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|----------------|
| DE | — | Questions included in creel census program | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| FL | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| GA | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other methods (please specify) | Health Department survey and feedback from fisheries field personnel | — |
| GLIFWC | — | — | — | Focus groups | — | Telephone surveys (of whom?) | — | targeted surveys of tribal spear harvesters and women of childbearing age | — |
| GU | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| HI | — | — | — | — | — | Telephone surveys (of whom?) | Other methods (please specify) | Hawaii Health Survey and biomonitoring for mercury | — |
| IA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| ID | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IL | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| IN | Feedback form/postcard in regulation pamphlet | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| KS | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| KY | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| LA | — | — | — | — | Mailed questionnaires (to whom?) | Telephone surveys (of whom?) | — | licensed recreational fishers | — |
| MA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

97. If yes, how is their effectiveness determined? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---|--|--|--------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|----------------|
| MD | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other methods (please specify) | The number of requests for brochures, pamphlets, fact sheets etc. is tracked in an Excel. More would be done but because of less staff and greater demands it is not possible. | — |
| ME | — | — | Questions included in state BRFS (Behavior Risk Factor Survey) | Focus groups | Mailed questionnaires (to whom?) | Telephone surveys (of whom?) | Other methods (please specify) | Mailed questionnaires to Women who have given birth; Telephone surveys of Women of childbearing age; Other - Survey through PRAMS - Pregnancy Risk Assmnt Monitoring Survey | — |
| ME ABM | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MI | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| MN | Feedback form/postcard in regulation pamphlet | Questions included in creel census program | Questions included in state BRFS (Behavior Risk Factor Survey) | Focus groups | — | — | — | — | — |
| MO | — | — | — | — | Mailed questionnaires (to whom?) | — | — | The Missouri Department of Conservation conducts fish surveys periodically, typically of licensed anglers. | — |
| MS | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

97. If yes, how is their effectiveness determined? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|---|--|-----|-----|----------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|----------------|
| MT | — | Questions included in creel census program | — | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| NC | — | Questions included in creel census program | — | — | — | — | Other methods (please specify) | question bank fishermen | — |
| ND | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NE | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NH | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other methods (please specify) | Women's health care providers | — |
| NJ | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NM | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NV | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| NY | Feedback form/postcard in regulation pamphlet | Questions included in creel census program | — | — | Mailed questionnaires (to whom?) | Telephone surveys (of whom?) | — | Mailed questionnaires to licensed anglers; Telephone surveys of licensed anglers | — |
| NY SRMT | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OH | — | Questions included in creel census program | — | — | — | — | Other methods (please specify) | WIC program survey | — |
| OK | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| OR | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| PA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| RI | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

97. If yes, how is their effectiveness determined? (Please check all that apply.) (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | R04 | R05 | R06 | R_Other | Specify | R_NA |
|-------------|-----|-----|-----|--------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|----------------|
| SC | — | — | — | — | — | — | Other methods (please specify) | web surveys; university studies | — |
| SD | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| SD CRST | — | — | — | Focus groups | — | — | Other methods (please specify) | Public Feedback | — |
| TN | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| TX | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| UT | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| VA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| VT | — | — | — | Focus groups | — | — | Other methods (please specify) | Local ethnic group leaders, pilot study with surveys conducted in conjunction with local medical school | — |
| WA | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WI | — | — | — | Focus groups | Mailed questionnaires (to whom?) | Telephone surveys (of whom?) | — | Mailed questionnaires to Various groups; Telephone surveys of Various groups, depends on focus of study | — |
| WV | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |
| WY | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | Not applicable |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
 ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
 SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

98. To your knowledge, have there been any studies in your state (including federal, tribal, and university based studies) to evaluate human tissue contaminant levels (e.g., in blood, urine, breast milk, or adipose tissues) or adverse human health effects related to fish consumption?

Don't know **5**
 No **19**
 Yes (please specify) **32**

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | Specify |
|-------------|------------|-----|---|--|
| AK | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | Division of Public Health, Epidemiology Section, Dr Joe McLaughlin 907-269-8000; Alaska National Tribal Health Consortium, Dr Jim Berner (907) 729-3640. |
| AL | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | currently studies underway to evaluate Hg from hair samples of gulf coast residents |
| AR | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | AR Department of Health mercury study |
| AZ | — | No | — | — |
| CA | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | ATSDR, Department of Health Services |
| CO | Don't know | — | — | — |
| CT | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | PCBs in blood, study from 1982 |
| DC | — | No | — | — |
| DE | — | No | — | — |
| FL | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | FL Dept. of Health (ongoing), CDC, Indian Health Service, University of Miami. University of West Florida (ongoing). |
| GA | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | ATSDR and Glynn County Health Department |
| GLIFWC | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | Ojibwe Health Study, UW-Milwaukee |
| GU | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | Guam DPHSS cancer surveillance data |
| HI | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | Environmentally-Related Illness and Injury Database and hair biomonitoring for mercury |
| IA | — | No | — | — |
| ID | — | No | — | — |
| IL | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | Great Lakes Charter Boat Captain Study includes some IL captains and families. Contact H. Anderson, WI Dept. of Health |
| IN | Don't know | — | — | — |

98. To your knowledge, have there been any studies in your state (including federal, tribal, and university based studies) to evaluate human tissue contaminant levels (e.g., in blood, urine, breast milk, or adipose tissues) or adverse human health effects related to fish consumption? (continued)

| State/Tribe | R01 | R02 | R03 | Specify |
|-------------|------------|-----|---|---|
| KS | — | No | — | — |
| KY | Don't know | — | — | — |
| LA | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | LDHH/OPH/SEET , Shannon Soileau 504-568-8537 (1-888-293-7020) |
| MA | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | MA Department of Public Health Bureau of Environmental Health |
| MD | — | No | — | — |
| ME | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | Biomonitoring program (HETL and EOHP) |
| ME ABM | — | No | — | — |
| MI | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | University of Michigan, Michigan Department of Community Health, Michigan State University |
| MN | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | Mercury in newborn blood spots (EPA grant), WI/ME study (EPA funded), UND EERC mercury hair analysis |
| MO | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | Department of Health did a study in 1992 on chlordane contamination, available from ATSDR |
| MS | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | Dioxin in blood was tested as part of a law suit against paper mills. Sea Grant tested mercury in hair from coastal residents. |
| MT | — | No | — | — |
| NC | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | Mercury in blood/hair of subsistence fishermen |
| ND | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | A study of mercury in human hair was conducted by the University of ND. |
| NE | — | No | — | — |
| NH | Don't know | — | — | — |
| NJ | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | NJDEP Office of Science. Research Project |
| NM | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | NM Dept. of Health |
| NV | — | No | — | — |
| NY | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | Dr. Philip Landrigan, Mt. Sinai School of Medicine, Dr. Paul Stewart, State University of New York at Oswego, Dr. John Vena, State University of New York at Buffalo, Dr. Philip Landrigan; Ongoing study - NYSDOH Bureau of Environmental and Occupational Epi |

| | | | | |
|---------|------------|----|---|---|
| NY SRMT | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | SUNY Albany, Superfund Research Unit |
| OH | — | No | — | — |
| OK | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | Ongoing study by University of Oklahoma and Harvard Schools of Public Health in Ottawa County looking at fish consumption rates, fish Hg levels, and human hair Hg levels. |
| OR | — | No | — | — |
| PA | Don't know | — | — | — |
| RI | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | Biomonitoring for heavy metals in cord blood but not specifically linked to fish consumption. |
| SC | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | Blood |
| SD | — | No | — | — |
| SD CRST | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | CDC |
| TN | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | ATSDR study at Watts Bar |
| TX | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | Study to evaluate mercury blood levels from individuals(subsistence fishers)who eat fish from Caddo Lake, TX. DSHS Environmental Injury Epidemiology and Toxicology Branch. |
| UT | — | No | — | — |
| VA | — | No | — | — |
| VT | — | No | — | — |
| WA | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | Dept. of Health, Univ. of Washigton |
| WI | — | — | Yes (please specify organization or agency) | WI Dept. of Health and Family Services in cooperation with ATSDR |
| WV | — | No | — | — |
| WY | — | No | — | — |

Note:

GLIFWC = Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission

ME AMB = Maine Aroostook Band of Micmacs

NY SRMT = New York St. Regis Mohawk Tribe

SD CRST = South Dakota Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe