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## Abstract

The Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) analyzed 13 polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDEs) in fish tissue samples from the Spokane River to characterize contaminant concentrations in the diet of osprey (Pandion haliaetus) nesting along the river. The project also assessed spatial and temporal trends in fish tissue PBDE concentrations since the river was last sampled in 2005. Sampling was conducted as part of a larger cooperative study with the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) investigating PBDE concentrations in osprey eggs along the Spokane River.

Fish were collected from six locations from the Idaho border through Long Lake during spring 2009. Reference samples were also collected from Rock Lake and Williams Lake. In total, 6 species were analyzed including 27 whole body, 9 fillet, and 8 carcass composite samples. Total PBDE concentrations in whole fish composites from the Spokane River ranged from $30.6-2,531 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{Kg}$ wet weight. Concentrations were generally higher in sportfish than in bottom dwellers. The highest concentrations were found in the lower sections of the river from the Nine Mile reach through Lower Long Lake.

Temporal trends in Spokane River PBDE concentrations were assessed by comparing PBDE results to an Ecology survey conducted in fall 2005. Largescale sucker (Catostomus macrocheilus) and mountain whitefish (Prosopium williamsoni) samples were paired between the two studies based on sampling location and fish composite length. Wet weight PBDE concentrations from the 2009 survey were lower in 21 of 23 paired samples, often by greater than $50 \%$. The apparent decline in PBDE concentrations was hypothesized to be associated with seasonal differences in fish physiology and river hydrology.
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## Introduction

## Background on PBDEs

Polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDEs) are hydrophobic, lipophilic contaminants composed of a diphenyl ether molecule with up to 10 bromine atoms attached to the rings allowing for 209 possible congeners (Figure 1). PBDEs have been manufactured since the 1970s as fire-retarding additives in numerous products including polyurethane foams, plastics, paints, textiles, and electronics (Rahman et al., 2001).


Figure 1. PBDE General Structure.

PBDEs are a high-volume production chemical with the majority of its use in North America (Alaee et al., 2003). Commercial production of PBDEs has primarily consisted of penta-BDE, octa-BDE, and deca-BDE formulations. Production of penta-BDE and octa-BDE was voluntarily phased out in the United States in 2004 due to concerns over their toxicity. The Washington State legislature passed legislation banning products containing penta- and octaBDEs (PBDE Rule, Chapter 70.76 RCW) in 2007 and deca-BDEs in upholstery and electronics in 2011 (Ecology and DOH, 2008). Recently, the two U.S. producers of deca-BDE and the largest importer agreed to end all production, importation, and sale of deca-BDE by 2013 (EPA, 2009).

Environmental release of PBDEs can occur during initial synthesis, incorporation into products, use and disposal via direct discharge, leaching, volatilization, incineration, wastewater treatment plants, and other sources (Hale et al., 2003). Once in the environment, PBDEs enter the aquatic food chain where they bioaccumulate. Deca-BDE is debrominated to lower brominated congeners through exposure to UV light, microorganisms, and metabolic processes in some fish species (Eriksson et al., 2004; Gerecke et al., 2005; Stapleton et al., 2006). This is of particular interest since lower brominated congeners are more toxic (Tomy et al., 2004; Kelly et al., 2008).

There is increasing experimental evidence that PBDE exposure may be detrimental to wildlife health, affecting sex and thyroid hormones, modulation of liver enzymes, immune system function, and neurological development (Kierkegaard et al., 2006; Darnerud et al., 2001; Birnbaum and Staskal, 2004). In order to address these concerns, the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) and Washington State Department of Health (DOH) finalized
a Chemical Action Plan for PBDEs in 2006. The plan outlines future steps to reduce the threat of PBDEs in the environment (Ecology and DOH, 2006).

## PBDEs in Washington State

Several studies have examined PBDEs in Washington State fish (Johnson and Olson, 2001; Seiders and Yake, 2002; Johnson et al., 2006), surface waters (Johnson et al., 2006; Sandvik, 2009), stormwater (Lubliner, 2009), wastewater treatment plant effluent (EIM Project ID YAKR37TX), and osprey eggs (Henny et al., 2009). In 2005, Ecology conducted a statewide PBDE survey along with a more intensive study of fish tissues from 6 reaches of the Spokane River (Johnson et al., 2006; Serdar and Johnson, 2006). Results from these studies have identified the Spokane River as having the highest PBDE levels in both water and fish tissue samples statewide.

Figure 2 displays a cumulative frequency graph of total PBDEs in Washington freshwater fish samples from various Ecology monitoring efforts. The Spokane River values are from sampling in 1999 and 2005. Currently, sources and causes of elevated PBDE concentrations in the Spokane River are unknown.


Figure 2. Cumulative Frequency Graph of Total PBDEs in Freshwater Fish Tissue Samples from Selected Ecology Studies.

The high levels of PBDE contamination in the Spokane River are relevant in a national context as well. Total concentrations in Spokane River fish measured by Serdar and Johnson (2006) were elevated compared to many previously reported values in North American rivers (Hites, 2004; Hale et al., 2003; Rayne et al., 2003; Xia, 2008). Hites (2004) reviewed PBDE concentrations of several studies nationwide conducted from 1994-2000. Mean concentrations of lipid-normalized PBDEs in suckers (largescale and bridgelip) and mountain whitefish collected by Serdar and Johnson (2006) were roughly 5 and 11 times greater, respectively, than the mean PBDE fish value calculated by Hites.

## Study Goals and Objectives

In view of the elevated water and fish tissue concentrations recorded along the Spokane River and the potential deleterious effects on wildlife, Ecology, in cooperation with USGS, conducted a one-time survey measuring PBDE concentrations in fish tissues and osprey eggs along the river during 2009.

This report details findings from the fish portion of the project. The primary goal of the fish tissue study is to assess PBDE exposure in the osprey diet. Secondary objectives of the fish tissue study are to:

- Identify spatial and fish species patterns in the environmental distribution and accumulation of PBDEs.
- Identify temporal trends in PBDE concentrations since the river was last sampled in 2005.

The primary objective of the USGS egg study is to determine if reproductive success of ospreys nesting on the Spokane River is negatively affected by PBDE exposure. Results from the osprey egg portion of the study will be reported by the USGS in 2010.

## Methods

## Study Design

Ecology collected fish samples from six reaches of the Spokane River from the Idaho border downstream through Long Lake (Figure 3). Fish collection sites were chosen to:

- Provide broad spatial coverage of the river upstream and downstream of the city of Spokane.
- Correspond with suspected feeding locations of osprey nesting along the river.

A secondary consideration for site selection was to match previous Ecology fish collection efforts from 2005. Fish and osprey eggs were also collected from Rock and Williams Lakes southwest of the city of Spokane to serve as reference values for the area. Detailed descriptions of sampling stations are in Appendix B.


Figure 3. Spokane River Fish Collection Locations.

Species selection at each Spokane River station was guided by the previous PBDE survey and fish suspected to be part of the osprey diet. Ospreys are opportunistic foragers; their diet often consists of 2 to 3 species, regardless of fish communities (Poole et al., 2002). Johnson et al. (2008) found largescale suckers to be the major component of osprey diets along the Columbia and Willamette Rivers representing $84.3 \%$ and $92.7 \%$ of biomass consumed, respectively. Largescale suckers are abundant in the Spokane River, and three composite samples from each river reach were collected to provide more data on this species.

Sample types consisted of whole body, fillet, or carcass composites. Carcass samples are the remainders of the fish after the fillet has been removed for processing. Whole fish PBDE concentrations were calculated from the relative weights of the fillet and carcass samples. Fillet and carcass samples were analyzed for mountain whitefish, rainbow trout, and smallmouth bass. A combination of samples was prepared for these species in order to (1) match sample type (fillet or whole body) from the 2005 study and (2) mimic osprey feeding habits (whole body). All largescale sucker and northern pikeminnow samples were analyzed as whole body.

All fish samples were collected during March and April 2009 to assess contaminant concentrations in the osprey diet prior to the egg laying period. Samples were analyzed for percent lipids and the following 13 PBDE congeners: $-47,-49,-66,-71,-99,-100,-138,-153$, $-154,-183,-184,-191,-209$.

The study was conducted according to a Quality Assurance Project Plan (Furl et al., 2009).

## Study Area

## Spokane River

The Spokane River drainage area covers approximately 6,000 square miles in northeastern Washington and northern Idaho (Figure 4). Boundaries for the drainage area are created by the Bitterroot Mountains to the east, the Selkirk Mountains to the north, and the Columbia Plateau to the south and west (Konrad, 2006). The river originates in northern Idaho where it drains Lake Coeur d'Alene and flows westerly approximately 110 miles before entering the Columbia River 30 miles upstream of Grand Coulee Dam.

Streamflow in the Spokane River is regulated by the Post Falls Dam in Idaho. Typically water is allowed to flow through the Post Falls Dam from December to June, and the gates are set to maintain a specific water level for Lake Coeur d'Alene during the summer months (Hortness and Covert, 2005). Several other dams along the Spokane River restrict upstream movement of fish, resulting in segmented fish populations (Figure 3).


Figure 4. Spokane River Drainage Area.

## Reference Sites

Rock and Williams Lakes were chosen to serve as local reference sites for fish tissue and osprey egg concentrations. The lakes are located approximately 30 miles southwest of the city of Spokane, and their drainage basins have experienced little development (Figure 4).

## Field Procedures

The collection, handling, and processing of fish tissue samples were guided by methods described in EPA's Guidance for Assessing Chemical Contaminant Data for Use in Fish Advisories (EPA, 2000) and Ecology's Standard Operating Procedures for Field Collection, Processing, and Preservation of Finfish Samples at the Time of Collection in the Field (Sandvik, 2006a). Fish were collected using boat electrofishing during March and April 2009.

Once captured, fish were inspected to ensure that they were acceptable for further processing (e.g., no obvious damage to tissues; skin intact). Acceptable fish were euthanized by a blow to the head with a dull object, rinsed in ambient water to remove foreign material from their exterior, weighed to the nearest gram, and their total lengths measured to the nearest millimeter. Individual fish were double-wrapped in foil and placed in a plastic zip-lock bag along with a sample identification tag. The bagged specimens were placed on ice in the field. Fish remained on ice until frozen $\left(-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ at Ecology headquarters.

## Laboratory Procedures

## Sample Preparation

Fish tissue samples were prepared following adapted guidelines from Ecology's Standard Operating Procedures for Resecting Finfish Whole Body, Body Parts or Tissue Samples (Sandvik, 2006b). Fish were removed from the freezer and partially thawed before processing. Slime and scales were removed from specimens being prepared for fillet analysis, with a subset of scales retained for age determination. Fish were then rinsed with tap water followed by a deionized water rinse. Skin-on fillets were removed from the fish in small cubes.

Fillet tissues from individual fish were passed through a Kitchen-Aid food grinder two times. For compositing, equal weights of fillet tissue were mixed together and homogenized a third time using a sonicator. Composite samples consisted of 3 to 5 individual fish. Whole fish and carcass composite samples were prepared the same as fillet composites using a Hobart commercial meat grinder instead of a Kitchen-Aid. The weight of the whole fish, fillet, and carcass were recorded to estimate whole fish concentrations when necessary. Subsamples of the homogenate were placed into laboratory-provided clean glass jars. Samples were assigned a Manchester Environmental Laboratory (MEL) identification number, refrozen, and shipped to the laboratory for analysis. Excess homogenate was labeled and archived at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ at Ecology Headquarters.

The sex of the fish was determined after tissue sample processing. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife biologists determined the age of the fish using otoliths and scales. Table 1 displays species retained from each reach along with sample processing information.

Table 1. Number of Composite Samples Analyzed by Species and Reach.
All samples are whole body except where indicated differently.

| Species | Species <br> (Common <br> Name) | Species <br> (Acronym) | State- <br> line | Plante <br> Ferry | Mission <br> Park | Nine <br> Mile <br> Res. | Upper <br> Long <br> Lake | Lower <br> Long <br> Lake | Rock <br> Lake | Williams <br> Lake |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Catostomus <br> macrocheilus | Largescale <br> sucker | LSS | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |  |
| Prosopium <br> williamsoni | Mountain <br> whitefish | MWF |  |  | $1 *$ | $3^{*}$ | $2^{*}$ |  |  |  |
| Ptychocheilus <br> oregonensis | Northern <br> pikeminnow | NPM |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |  |
| Micropterus <br> dolomieu | Smallmouth <br> bass | SMB |  |  |  |  | $2^{*}$ |  |  |  |
| Oncorhynchus <br> mykiss | Rainbow <br> trout | RBT |  | $1^{*}$ |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Salmo trutta | Brown <br> trout | BNT |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |

All sample composites include 3 to 5 fish.

* fillet plus carcass.


## Sample Analysis

The tissue samples were extracted by Soxtherm following MEL Standard Operating Procedure (MEL SOP) 730101 (adapted from EPA method SW846 3541). Following extraction, $10 \%$ of the sample was split off and used for lipid analysis. The remainder of the sample received micro florisil column cleanup following MEL SOP 730091 and was concentrated to a final volume of 2 mL . The extracts were then treated with acid for further cleanup.

PBDEs were determined by EPA method 8270 for semi-volatile analysis in SIM mode following MEL SOP 730104. Percent lipid was determined gravimetrically according to MEL SOP 730009.

## Data Quality

MEL provided case narratives assessing the analytical quality of the data. Case narratives are available upon request. These include summaries of analytical methods, assessment of holding times, instrument tuning, initial and continuing calibrations, method blanks, matrix spikes, laboratory control samples, surrogate spikes, internal standards, duplicate spikes, and standard reference material (SRM).

All 44 samples were run in three analytical batches. Quality control tests along with the rates at which they were conducted are included in Table 2.

Table 2. Quality Control Tests and Measurement Quality Objectives.

| Quality Control Test | Measurement <br> Quality Objective | Test Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Surrogate Recovery | $50-150 \%$ recovery | every sample |
| Laboratory Control Sample | $50-150 \%$ recovery | $1 /$ batch |
| Method Blank | non-detect | $1 /$ batch |
| Matrix Spike | $50-150 \%$ recovery | $1 /$ batch |
| Matrix Spike Duplicate | $<40 \%$ RPD | $1 /$ batch |
| Duplicate | $<40 \%$ RPD | $1 /$ batch |
| Standard Reference Material | no criteria | $1 /$ batch |

RPD $=$ Relative Percent Difference.

Data quality for PBDE analyses was generally good across the entire project. Below is a description of results outside of the laboratory's guidelines. Complete results for all Quality Control tests are located in Appendix C.

No recovery of surrogate spikes occurred in two samples (\#0905034-01 and -02; Stateline LSS 1 and 2) during the original analysis, requiring the samples to be rerun (\#0905034-01RE1 and
-02RE1). Quality control tests on the two samples included a method blank, laboratory control sample, surrogate spikes, and SRM. Quality control results for the two sample batch are included in Appendix C.

Instrument tuning, initial calibrations, and continuing calibrations were all met within laboratory guidelines with the exception of a few continuing calibration verifications (CCVs) for PBDE 209. No action was required since PBDE 209 was not detected in any of the samples on days the CCV was outside of laboratory limits.

Low levels of PBDEs 47, 99, and 209 were detected in two of the method blanks (Table 3). Concentrations were considered native to the sample if they were 5 times greater than the sample blank. Results for these congeners less than 5 times blank contamination were qualified as estimates (J).

Table 3. Results ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{kg}$ ) of Laboratory Method Blank Analyses.

| Sample <br> Number | PBDE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 47 | 99 | 209 |
|  | $<$ MDL | - | 12.8 J |
| B09E075-BLK1 | $<$ MDL | $<$ MDL | 1.38 |

Method detection limit $=0.22$.
$\mathrm{J}=$ Estimated value

Hexabromobiphenyl was spiked into all samples prior to extraction and served as a surrogate for estimating recovery of the target compounds. Recoveries were high (> 150\%) in four samples (0905034-02RE1, 03, 15, 17), and results for those samples were qualified as estimates (J).

Recovery of PBDE 209 was low in both matrix spike \#B09E135-MS1 and matrix spike duplicate \#B09E135-MSD1. Results for PBDE 209 were already qualified in native sample \#0905034-44 based on low continuing calibration response. Recoveries for PBDE 138, 183, 191, and 209 were high in matrix spike \#B09E072-MS1 and matrix spike duplicate \#B09E072-MSD1. None of the compounds were detected in the native sample.

## Data Processing

## Summing

Total PBDE values are reported as the sum of detected values for 13 target congeners. Values qualified as estimates ( J and NJ) by the laboratory are treated as detected values. Non-detect values ( U and UJ) are assigned a value of zero when other congeners making up the sum are detected. If qualified congeners ( J and/or NJ ) comprise greater than $10 \%$ of the total summed concentration, the total concentration is qualified. When all individual congeners are reported as non-detects ( U and/or UJ), the highest reporting limit, appropriately qualified, represents the sum.

## Whole Fish Calculations

Whole fish results were determined in 8 samples by analyzing a fillet sample and the remaining carcass. A whole body concentration was calculated from the concentrations and relative weights of the sample using the following calculation:

$$
\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{w}}=\left[\left(\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{f}} * \mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{f}}\right)+\left(\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{r}} * \mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{r}}\right)\right] /\left(\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{f}}+\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{r}}\right)
$$

Where:
C $=$ concentration ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ww)
$\mathrm{M}=$ weight ( Kg )
$\mathrm{w}=$ whole fish
$\mathrm{f}=$ fillet
$\mathrm{r}=$ carcass

## Trends Analysis

Changes in largescale sucker and mountain whitefish PBDE concentrations were examined visually by graphing total and lipid-normalized concentrations with those reported by Serdar and Johnson (2006). Samples were paired according to composite length at each location. Changes in concentrations were further assessed by calculating percent change in total and lipidnormalized values by:

$$
\%_{\mathbf{\Delta}}=\left[\left(\operatorname{abs}\left(\mathrm{C}_{2005}-\mathrm{C}_{2009}\right)\right) / \mathrm{C}_{2005}\right] * 100
$$

Where:
$\% \mathbf{4}=$ percent change
abs $=$ absolute value
$\mathrm{C}_{2005}=$ concentration from 2005 study
$\mathrm{C}_{2009}=$ concentration from 2009 study

Fish from the current 2009 study were retained within 1 river mile of the previous investigation. In 2005, bridgelip suckers were collected from the Nine Mile reach. Fish were collected for the initial study during the fall of 2005. Time between sample collections for the two studies was approximately 3.5 years.

## Results and Discussion

## Occurrence of PBDEs in Spokane River Fish

PBDE and lipid results from the Spokane River and the 2 reference lakes are shown in Table 4. Complete ancillary fish data are included in Appendix D.

Table 4. PBDE and Lipid Concentrations in Fish Collected from the Spokane River and Two Reference Waterbodies, 2009.

| Spokane RiverReach | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Collection } \\ & \text { Date } \end{aligned}$ | Sample ID | Species | Tissue | PBDEs ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{Kg} \mathrm{ww}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lipids (\%) | Total PBDEs ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ww) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Lipid- } \\ \text { normalized } \\ \text { Total } \\ \text { PBDEs } \\ (\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{Kg} \text { lipid }) \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | 47 | 49 | 66 | 71 | 99 | 100 | 138 | 153 | 154 | 183 | 184 | 191 | 209 |  |  |  |
| Stateline | 3/4/2009 | 0905034-01 | LSS | Whole | 66 | 0.79 J | 1.6 U | 1.6 U | 1.6 U | 10 | 3.2 U | 1.6 J | 3.2 J | 3.2 U | 3.2 U | 3.2 U | 8 U | 6.98 | 81.6 | 1169 |
|  |  | 0905034-02 | LSS | Whole | 87 J | 1.7 J | 1.5 U | 1.5 U | 1.5 U | 13 J | 3 U | 2.2 J | 3.7 J | 3 U | 3 U | 3 U | 7.5 U | 6.82 | 107.6 J | 1578 |
| " | " | 0905034-03 | LSS | Whole | 120 J | 2.1 J | 0.88 U | 0.88 U | 0.88 U | 23 J | 1.8 U | 4 J | 6.8 J | 1.8 U | 1.8 U | 1.8 U | 15 UJ | 4.45 | 155.9 J | 3503 |
| Plante Ferry | 3/4/2009 | 0905034-04 | LSS | Whole | 57 | 4.4 U | 4.4 U | 4.4 U | 4.4 U | 11 | 8.8 U | 8.8 U | 4.6 J | 8.8 U | 8.8 U | 8.8 U | 22 U | 5.91 | 72.6 | 1228 |
|  |  | 0905034-05 | LSS | Whole | 77 | 4.4 U | 4.4 U | 4.4 U | 4.4 U | 14 | 8.8 U | 2.7 J | 5.3 J | 8.8 U | 8.8 U | 8.8 U | 22 U | 6.69 | 99.0 | 1480 |
| " | " | 0905034-06 | LSS | Whole | 74 | 2.2 | 0.44 U | 0.44 U | 0.44 U | 14 | 0.88 U | 2.5 | 5.3 | 0.88 U | 0.88 U | 0.88 U | 21 UJ | 4.65 | 98.0 | 2108 |
| " | " | 0905034-19/20 | RBT | Whole* | 83 | 3 | 2 | 0.43 UJ | 47 | 17 | 0.87 UJ | 5 | 4 | 0.87 UJ | 0.87 UJ | 0.87 UJ | 2.20 UJ | 4.58 | 162 | 3542 |
| " | " | 0905034-19 | RBT | Fillet | 47 | 1.7 | 1.1 | 0.43 U | 28 | 10 | 0.87 U | 3.1 | 2.6 | 0.87 U | 0.87 U | 0.87 U | 2.2 U | 2.34 | 93.5 | 3996 |
| Mission Park | 3/3/2009 | 0905034-07 | LSS | Whole | 24 | 0.44 U | 0.44 U | 0.44 U | 0.44 U | 4.4 | 0.87 U | 0.6 J | 1.6 | 0.87 U | 0.87 U | 0.87 U | 12 UJ | 4.3 | 30.6 | 712 |
|  |  | 0905034-08 | LSS | Whole | 23 | 1.7 | 0.44 U | 0.44 U | 0.44 U | 8 | 0.88 U | 0.6 J | 2.7 | 0.88 U | 0.88 U | 0.88 U | 2.2 U | 3.23 | 36.0 | 1115 |
| " | " | 0905034-09 | LSS | Whole | 26 | 0.43 U | 0.43 U | 0.43 U | 0.43 U | 5.2 | 0.85 U | 0.31 J | 1.9 | 0.85 U | 0.85 U | 0.85 U | 21 UJ | 2.77 | 33.4 | 1206 |
| " | " | 0905034-21/22 | MwF | Whole* | 139 | 10 | 7 | 0.44 UJ | 165 | 41 | 0.87 UJ | 18 | 13 | 0 | 0.87 UJ | 0.87 UJ | 2.20 UJ | 3.16 | 392 | 12420 |
| " | " | 0905034-21 | MWF | Fillet | 90 | 6.4 | 4.4 | 0.43 U | 100 | 28 | 0.86 U | 12 | 8.5 | 0.86 U | 0.86 U | 0.86 U | 2.14 | 1.72 | 249.3 | 14494 |
| Nine Mile | 4/7/2009 | 0905034-10 | LSS | Whole | 100 | 2.3 | 0.44 U | 0.44 U | 0.44 U | 28 | 0.87 U | 7.5 | 7.4 | 0.87 U | 0.87 U | 0.87 U | 20 UJ | 4.54 | 145.2 | 3198 |
|  | " | 0905034-11 | LSS | Whole | 100 | 0.52 | 0.43 U | 0.43 U | 0.2 J | 20 | 0.85 U | 3.7 | 5.6 | 0.85 U | 0.85 U | 0.85 U | 2.14 | 3.02 | 130.0 | 4305 |
| " | " | 0905034-12 | LSS | Whole | 230 | 2.6 | 0.44 U | 0.44 U | 0.89 | 88 | 0.88 U | 8.8 | 18 | 0.88 U | 0.88 U | 0.88 U | 2.2 U | 1.82 | 348.3 | 19137 |
| " | " | 0905034-26/27 | MwF | Whole* | 358 | 10 | 12 | 0.43 UJ | 287 | 72 | 0.86 U | 19 | 21 | 0.61 | 0.86 UJ | 0.86 U | 2.10 uJ | 2.61 | 780 | 29893 |
| " | " | 0905034-26 | MWF | Fillet | 180 | 3.9 | 5.4 | 0.44 U | 150 | 36 | 0.88 U | 12 | 10 | 0.29 J | 0.88 U | 0.88 U | 2.2 U | 1.08 | 397.6 | 36814 |
| " | " | 0905034-28/29 | MWF | Whole* | 572 | 11 | 17 | 0.44 UJ | 564 | 144 | 0.88 UJ | 40 | 34 | 0.79 | 0.88 UJ | 0.88 UJ | 2.20 UJ | 2.88 | 1382 | 47976 |
| " | " | 0905034-28 | MWF | Fillet | 240 | 7.1 | 10 | 0.44 U | 240 | 74 | 0.89 U | 20 | 24 | 0.45 J | 0.89 U | 0.89 U | 2.2 U | 1.36 | 615.6 | 45261 |
| " | " | 0905034-30/31 | MwF | Whole* | 943 | 42 | 44 | 0.44 UJ | 943 | 368 | 0.88 UJ | 108 | 81 | 1.36 | 0 | 0.87 UJ | 2.20 uJ | 3.14 | 2531 | 80602 |
| " | " | 0905034-30 | MWF | Fillet | 700 | 40 | 40 | 0.43 U | 700 | 360 | 0.85 U | 100 | 78 | 0.75 J | 0.85 U | 0.85 U | 2.14 | 1.66 | 2018.8 | 121611 |
| Upper Long Lake | 4/7/2009 | 0905034-13 | LSS | Whole | 110 | 3.1 | 0.43 U | 0.43 U | 0.43 U | 23 | 0.85 U | 1.6 | 5.1 | 0.29 J | 0.85 U | 0.85 U | 4.3 UJ | 4.11 | 143.1 | 3482 |
| " | " | 0905034-14 | LSS | Whole | 200 | 3.5 | 0.42 U | 0.42 U | 0.42 U | 38 | 0.85 U | 4 | 8 | 0.85 U | 0.85 U | 0.85 U | 9.8 UJ | 4.7 | 253.5 | 5394 |
| " | " | 0905034-15 | LSS | Whole | 250 J | 0.44 U | 0.44 U | 0.44 U | 0.31 J | 45 J | 0.88 U | 6.6 J | 12 J | 0.88 U | 0.88 U | 0.88 U | 17 UJ | 7.1 | 131.9 J | 1858 |
| " | " | 0905034-35/36 | MWF | Whole* | 127 | 7 | 4 | 0.43 UJ | 81 | 26 | 0.87 UJ | 6 | 7 | 0.87 UJ | 0.87 UJ | 0.87 UJ | 2.20 UJ | 0.68 | 258 | 37991 |
| " | " | 0905034-35 | MWF | Fillet | 72 | 4.6 | 2.4 | 0.41 U | 47 | 15 | 0.81 U | 4.1 | 4.7 | 0.81 U | 0.81 U | 0.81 U | 2 U | 0.28 | 149.8 | 53500 |
| " | " | 0905034-37/38 | MWF | Whole* | 156 | 8 | 3 | 0.40 UJ | 85 | 41 | 0.80 UJ | 9 | 12 | 0.80 UJ | 0.80 UJ | 0.80 UJ | 4.20 UJ | 3.61 | 315 | 8739 |
| " | " | 0905034-37 | MWF | Fillet | 99 | 4.8 | 2.2 | 0.4 U | 53 | 25 | 0.8 U | 5.2 | 7 | 0.8 U | 0.8 U | 0.8 U | 2 UJ | 0.14 | 196.2 | 140143 |
| " | " | 0905034-39 | NPM | Whole | 110 | 6.5 | 0.39 U | 0.39 U | 0.39 U | 30 | 0.78 U | 3.6 | 8.8 | 0.78 U | 0.78 U | 0.78 U | 2.3 UJ | 4.56 | 158.9 | 3485 |
| " | " | 0905034-40 | NPM | Whole | 160 | 9.6 | 0.4 U | 0.4 U | 0.4 U | 36 | 0.79 U | 2.6 | 8.3 | 0.79 U | 0.79 U | 0.79 U | 2 UJ | 3.18 | 216.5 | 6808 |
| " | " | 0905034-41 | NPM | Whole | 100 | 8.6 | 0.4 U | 0.4 U | 0.4 U | 29 | 0.79 U | 0.34 J | 7.1 | 0.79 U | 0.79 U | 0.79 U | 4 UJ | 2.44 | 145.0 | 5944 |
| " | " | 0905034-32/33 | SMB | Whole* | 114 | 10 | 2 | 0.44 UJ | 32 | 19 | 0.89 UJ | 5 | 5 | 0.89 UJ | 0.89 UJ | 0.89 UJ | 2.20 uJ | 4.34 | 187 | 4298 |
| " | " | 0905034-32 | SMB | Fillet | 46 | 4.1 | 0.81 | 0.43 U | 13 | 8.3 | 0.87 U | 1.8 | 1.9 | 0.87 U | 0.87 U | 0.87 U | 2.2 U | 1.64 | 75.9 | 4629 |
| " | " | 0905034-34 | SMB | Fillet | 87 | 3.8 | 1.1 | 0.44 U | 58 | 8.7 | 0.88 U | 2 | 2 | 0.88 U | 0.88 U | 0.88 U | 2.2 U | 1.45 | 162.6 | 11214 |
| Lower Long Lake | 4/8/2009 | 0905034-16 | LSS | Whole | 96 | 5.6 | 0.44 U | 0.44 U | 0.44 U | 17 | 0.87 U | 2.4 | 3.7 | 0.87 U | 0.87 U | 0.87 U | 4.8 UJ | 5.75 | 124.7 | 2169 |
| " |  | 0905034-17 | LSS | Whole | 270 J | 8 J | 0.44 U | 0.44 U | 0.44 U | 31 J | 0.88 U | 2.8 J | 8.1 J | 0.88 U | 0.88 U | 0.88 U | 9.7 UJ | 4.7 | 319.9 J | 6806 |
| " | " | 0905034-18 | LSS | Whole | 130 | 5 | 0.43 U | 0.43 U | 0.43 U | 22 | 0.86 U | 1.6 | 4.2 | 0.86 U | 0.86 U | 0.86 U | 2.14 | 4.24 | 162.8 | 3840 |
| " | " | 0905034-42 | NPM | Whole | 150 | 11 | 0.39 U | 0.39 U | 0.39 U | 47 | 0.79 U | 4 | 13 | 0.79 U | 0.79 U | 0.79 U | 2 UJ | 5.48 | 225.0 | 4106 |
| " | " | 0905034-43 | NPM | Whole | 70 | 5.3 | 0.4 U | 0.4 U | 0.4 U | 17 | 0.8 U | 1.1 | 4.6 | 0.8 U | 0.8 U | 0.8 U | 4.8 UJ | 4.21 | 98.0 | 2328 |
| " | " | 0905034-44 | NPM | Whole | 59 | 6.2 | 0.4 U | 0.4 U | 0.25 J | 19 | 0.8 U | 1.7 | 4.8 | 0.8 U | 0.8 U | 0.8 U | 4 UJ | 1.73 | 91.0 | 5257 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Es ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{K}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lipid- |
| Reference Waterbody | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Collection } \\ & \text { Date } \end{aligned}$ | Sample ID | Species | Tissue | 47 | 49 | 66 | 71 | 99 | 100 | 138 | 153 | 154 | 183 | 184 | 191 | 209 | Lipids (\%) | PBDEs ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ww) | normalized <br> Total <br> PBDEs <br> ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{Kg}$ lipid) |
| Rock Lake | 4/6/2009 | 0905034-24 | BNT | Whole | 0.29 J | 0.43 U | 0.43 U | 0.43 U | 0.43 U | 0.43 U | 0.87 U | 0.87 U | 0.87 U | 0.87 U | 0.87 U | 0.87 U | 2.2 U | 0.65 | 0.3 | 45 |
| Rock Lake | 4/6/2009 | 0905034-23 | RBT | Whole | 0.43 U | 0.43 U | 0.43 U | 0.43 U | 0.43 U | 0.43 U | 0.85 U | 0.85 U | 0.85 U | 0.85 U | 0.85 U | 0.85 U | 2.14 | 2.21 | 2.1 U | 95 |
| Williams Lake | 4/8/2009 | 0905034-25 | RBT | Whole | 48 | 4.1 | 2 | 0.43 U | 89 | 19 | 0.86 U | 14 | 10 | 0.19 J | 0.86 U | 0.86 U | 2.14 | 1.44 | 186.3 | 12937 |

$\mathrm{U}=$ Analyte not detected at or above reported quantitation limit.
$\mathrm{UJ}=$ Analyte not detected at or above reported quantitation limit. Quantitation limit is approximate.
$\mathrm{UJ}=$ Analyte not detec
$\mathrm{J}=$ Estimated value.

* $=$ Whole body value calculated using carcass + fillet.
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Total PBDE concentrations in whole fish composites from the Spokane River ranged from $30.6-2,531 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{Kg}$ wet weight (ww). Figure 5 presents a boxplot of PBDE concentrations by species. Table 5 provides a statistical summary of individual congeners from the three most prevalent species: northern pikeminnow, mountain whitefish, and largescale suckers. For summary statistics, the reporting limit was used to calculate values when non-detects were present.


Figure 5. Boxplot of Total PBDE Concentrations by Fish Species.

Table 5. Statistical Summary of PBDE Concentrations ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{Kg} w w$ ) in Northern Pikeminnow, Mountain Whitefish, and Largescale Sucker Composites Collected from the Spokane River in Spring 2009.

| NPM ( $\mathrm{n}=6$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PBDE | Detection <br> Frequency (\%) | Minimum | Median | Mean | Maximum |  |
| 47 | 100 | 59.0 | 105.0 | 108.2 | 160.0 |  |
| 49 | 100 | 5.3 | 7.6 | 7.9 | 11.0 |  |
| 66 | 0 | $<0.39$ | --- | --- | $<0.40$ |  |
| 71 | 0 | $<0.39$ | -- | --- | $<0.40$ |  |
| 99 | 17 | 0.3 | $<0.40$ | $<0.37$ | $<0.40$ |  |
| 100 | 100 | 17.0 | 29.5 | 29.7 | 47.0 |  |
| 138 | 0 | $<0.78$ | -- | --- | $<0.80$ |  |
| 153 | 100 | 0.3 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 4.0 |  |
| 154 | 100 | 4.6 | 7.7 | 7.8 | 13.0 |  |
| 183 | 0 | $<0.78$ | --- | --- | $<0.80$ |  |
| 184 | 0 | $<0.78$ | --- | --- | $<0.80$ |  |
| 191 | 0 | $<0.78$ | --- | --- | $<0.80$ |  |
| 209 | 0 | $<2$ | --- | --- | $<4.8$ |  |


| MWF ( $\mathrm{n}=6$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PBDE | Detection <br> Frequency (\%) | Minimum | Median | Mean | Maximum |  |
| 47 | 100 | 127.0 | 257.2 | 382.4 | 942.6 |  |
| 49 | 100 | 7.3 | 9.9 | 14.8 | 42.4 |  |
| 66 | 100 | 3.5 | 9.4 | 14.5 | 44.0 |  |
| 71 | 0 | $<0.40$ | -- | -- | $<0.44$ |  |
| 99 | 100 | 81.0 | 226.1 | 354.1 | 942.6 |  |
| 100 | 100 | 26.3 | 56.8 | 115.4 | 368.1 |  |
| 138 | 0 | $<0.80$ | --- | --- | $<0.88$ |  |
| 153 | 100 | 6.3 | 18.5 | 33.4 | 108.1 |  |
| 154 | 100 | 7.0 | 17.1 | 28.0 | 81.2 |  |
| 183 | 67 | 0.3 | $<0.79$ | $<0.79$ | 1.4 |  |
| 184 | 17 | 0.4 | $<0.87$ | $<0.78$ | $<0.88$ |  |
| 191 | 0 | $<0.80$ | --- | --- | $<0.88$ |  |
| 209 | 0 | $<2.1$ | --- | --- | $<4.2$ |  |


| LSS ( $\mathrm{n}=18$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PBDE | Detection <br> Frequency (\%) | Minimum | Median | Mean | Maximum |  |
| 47 | 100 | 87.0 | 185.0 | 182.0 | 270.0 |  |
| 49 | 72 | $<0.43$ | $<1.7$ | $<2.5$ | 8.0 |  |
| 66 | 0 | $<0.42$ | - | - | $<4.4$ |  |
| 71 | 0 | $<0.42$ | - | - | $<4.4$ |  |
| 99 | 17 | 0.2 | $<0.44$ | $<1.0$ | $<4.4$ |  |
| 100 | 100 | 13.0 | 27.0 | 28.0 | 45.0 |  |
| 138 | 0 | $<0.85$ | - | - | $<8.8$ |  |
| 153 | 94 | 0.3 | $<2.45$ | $<3.02$ | 8.8 |  |
| 154 | 100 | 3.2 | 5.3 | 6.2 | 12.0 |  |
| 183 | 6 | 0.3 | $<0.88$ | $<2.02$ | $<8.8$ |  |
| 184 | 0 | $<0.85$ | - | - | $<8.8$ |  |
| 191 | 0 | $<0.85$ | - | - | $<8.8$ |  |
| 209 | 0 | $<2.1$ | - | - | $<22$ |  |

On average, PBDE 47 was the largest contributor to total concentrations across all species. Figure 6 displays the average percent contribution of each individual congener to the total PBDE sum (whole fish) for each of the 5 species encountered.

Largescale suckers and northern pikeminnow contained larger percentages of PBDE 47 than other species and accumulated very little PBDE 99. PBDE 100 represented the second largest contributor to the total sum in suckers and northern pikeminnow. PBDE 47 and 100 together accounted for $88 \%$ and $92 \%$ of total PBDEs in northern pikeminnow and largescale suckers, respectively.

Congener patterns in mountain whitefish, rainbow trout, and smallmouth bass whole body samples were similar to suckers and northern pikeminnow with the exception of significant accumulation of PBDE 99. PBDEs 47, 99, and 100 accounted for greater than $88 \%$ of total PBDEs in those species following the pattern of $47>99>100$.


Figure 6. Mean Percent Contribution of Individual PBDE Congeners to Total PBDE Sums Measured in Whole Fish Collected from the Spokane River, 2009.

## PBDEs in Fillet vs. Whole Fish

Fillet and carcass tissues were analyzed from several sportfish samples (Table 4). Whole fish concentrations were calculated using their relative weights and concentrations. A combination of sample types was used to (1) match sample type from the 2005 Spokane River PBDE study and (2) mimic osprey feeding habits. Fillet PBDE concentrations were less than whole fish in all cases. Whole fish concentrations were approximately $25-150 \%$ higher than fillets. Results are located in Table 6.

Table 6. PBDE Concentrations ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{Kg} \mathrm{ww}$ ) in Rainbow Trout, Mountain Whitefish, and Smallmouth Bass Fillet and Whole Fish Composites.

| Reach | Species | Fillet ID | Fillet <br> Concentration | Whole Fish <br> Concentration | Percentage <br> Increase <br> over Fillet <br> Concentration |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Plante Ferry | RBT | $0905034-19$ | 93.5 | 162 | $73.3 \%$ |
| Mission Park | MWF | $0905034-21$ | 249.3 | 392 | $57.2 \%$ |
| Nine Mile | MWF | $0905034-26$ | 397.6 | 780 | $96.2 \%$ |
|  |  | 615.6 | 1382 | $124.5 \%$ |  |
|  | $0905034-30$ | 2018.8 | 2531 | $25.4 \%$ |  |
| Upper Long <br> Lake | SMB | $0905034-32$ | 75.9 | 187 | $146.4 \%$ |
|  | MWF | $0905034-35$ | 149.8 | 258 | $72.2 \%$ |
|  | $0905034-37$ | 196.2 | 315 | $60.6 \%$ |  |

## Correlation of Total PBDEs with Fish Characteristics

Pearson correlations were computed to examine relationships between whole fish wet weight PBDE concentrations and fish physical characteristics (Table 7). Correlations were calculated at each reach where 3 composites of a single species were retained. Simple linear regressions are displayed in Appendix E.

Length, weight, and age generally displayed a strong positive relationship with PBDEs at all reaches. Positive correlations between PBDEs and fish age and size have been documented in Washington and elsewhere (Johnson et al., 2006; Hale et al., 2001; Loganathan et al., 1995). Northern pikeminnow from Upper and Lower Long Lake were the only samples where size and age were negatively correlated with PBDEs.

Percent lipids displayed a wide ranging relationship with PBDE concentrations. In largescale suckers, the correlation ranged from -0.957 to 0.846 with an average correlation coefficient from the six reaches of -0.345 . Strong positive relationships were found in sportfish at Nine Mile and Lower Long Lake. Inconsistent relationships between lipids and PBDEs were not expected due to their lipophilic properties. Johnson et al. (2006) noted a positive relationship between PBDEs and lipids in multiple Washington State waterbodies.

Table 7. Correlations between Total PBDEs ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ww) in Whole Fish and Fish Physical Characteristics.

| Reach | Species | Correlation Coefficient (r) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percent <br> Lipids | Length | Weight | Age |
| Stateline | LSS | -0.957 | 1 | 0.948 | 0.988 |
| Plante Ferry | LSS | -0.101 | 0.712 | 0.756 | 0.723 |
| Mission Park | LSS | -0.699 | 0.527 | 0.496 | 0.954 |
| Nine Mile | LSS | -0.794 | 0.734 | 0.869 | 0.876 |
| Upper Long Lake | LSS | 0.876 | 0.999 | 1 | 0.822 |
| Lower Long Lake | LSS | -0.396 | 0.319 | 0.285 | 0.634 |
| Average: | LSS | -0.345 | 0.715 | 0.726 | 0.833 |


| Reach | Species | Correlation Coefficient (r) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percent <br> Lipids | Length | Weight | Age |
| Nine Mile | MWF | 0.982 | 0.928 | 0.908 | 0.933 |
| Upper Long Lake | NPM | 0.011 | -0.143 | -0.148 | -0.002 |
| Lower Long Lake | NPM | 0.789 | -0.906 | -0.901 | -0.713 |

## PBDE Concentrations in Statewide and Reference Waterbodies

As anticipated, PBDE concentrations in Spokane River fish are highly elevated over other freshwater areas across the state. Figure 7 displays a cumulative frequency graph of PBDE concentrations in selected freshwater fish fillets from other areas in Washington ( $\mathrm{n}=309$ ). Data collected from the current 2009 study are graphed along with the statewide concentrations. Fillet concentrations are used where available (sportfish) for the Spokane River in order to match the statewide data pool.

Fish tissue samples were also collected from Rock and Williams Lakes to serve as reference values for the area. Rock Lake PBDE concentrations in rainbow and brown trout whole body samples were low ( 2.1 U and $0.3 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{Kg} \mathrm{ww}$, respectively).

A single whole body rainbow trout sample from Williams Lake contained a concentration previously unseen in an undeveloped area ( $186.3 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ww). The tissue sample was reextracted and reanalyzed, confirming the original analysis. Aging of the trout indicated they were hatchery fish (personal communication, Lucinda Williams WDFW). Over 10,000 catchable rainbow trout were planted in Williams Lake within 2 weeks of fish collections. Fish were collected from the lake after stocking due to local knowledge indicating osprey nesting on the lake fed primarily on hatchery rainbow trout.


Figure 7. Cumulative Frequency of Fish Tissue PBDE Values in Statewide Waterbodies (2001-2008) and the Spokane River (2009).

Causes for the elevated concentrations in Williams Lake hatchery rainbow trout are unknown. Serdar et al. (2006) examined PBDE concentrations in hatchery rainbow trout and their feed at 10 hatcheries around the state. Concentrations in catchable-sized rainbow trout collected from the hatcheries ranged from $0.24-1.10 \mathrm{~J} \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ww, consistent with values for Rock Lake. PBDE burdens from hatchery environments are not applicable to Spokane River trout. Trout captured from the Spokane River were native redband rainbow trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss gairdneri).

## PBDE Trends in the Spokane River

## Spatial Distribution

The 6 sampling locations along the Spokane River cover approximately 60 river miles. Within this stretch, 5 hydroelectric dams (Upriver Dam RM 79.9, Monroe Street Dam/Upper Falls Dam RM 73.4, Nine Mile Dam RM 57.6, and Lake Spokane Dam RM 33.9) exist, resulting in segmented fish populations (Figure 3). Fish movement between reaches is obstructed with the exceptions of Stateline/Plante Ferry and Upper/Lower Long Lake. These stations are separated by $>10$ miles.

Figures 8 and 9 display mean total PBDE concentrations in whole body samples at each reach for largescale suckers and sportfish, respectively.


Figure 8. Mean Total PBDE Concentrations in Spokane River Largescale Suckers (whole body) Collected in 2009.
Number of composite samples included in average concentrations is indicated above bars.


Figure 9. Mean Total PBDE Concentrations in Spokane River Sportfish (whole body) Collected in 2009.
Number of composite samples included in average concentrations is indicated above bars

The highest PBDE concentrations in the study were found in the three downstream reaches of the river, particularly the Nine Mile stretch. Concentrations in largescale suckers display a decreasing trend from the border through Mission Park and are elevated from Nine Mile through Lower Long Lake. The spatial trend in largescale suckers closely matches findings by Serdar and Johnson (2006).

The same broad spatial pattern could not be confirmed in sportfish due to species changes among reaches. However, the highest sportfish concentrations (mountain whitefish) in the study were again from the Nine Mile reach.

The Riverside Park Water Reclamation Facility (WWTP) discharges effluent three river miles upstream of the Nine Mile sampling station. While the causes of the fish contamination are unknown, the large disparity between the Mission Park and Nine Mile stations indicates a new source of PBDEs between the sample stations. WWTPs have been shown to be sources of PBDEs to aquatic environments (Song et al., 2006). In addition to the WWTP, Latah (Hangman) Creek enters the Spokane River between the sample stations. The Latah Creek watershed is largely rural and can deliver substantial sediment loads to the river.

## Temporal Trends

Changes in PBDE concentrations over time were assessed by comparing data from the 2005 Spokane River study (Serdar and Johnson, 2006) and the current 2009 survey.

## Largescale Suckers

Largescale suckers were the most abundant species encountered along the Spokane River and provide the best data set to examine temporal trends. A total of 18 whole body composites were analyzed from 6 reaches in both the 2005 study and the 2009 study. Samples from the two studies were paired based on sample length at each reach. Relative percent difference (RPD) between composite lengths was less than $5 \%$ in all cases except the largest sucker composite from the Nine Mile station (13.7\%).

Figures 10 and 11 present wet weight and lipid-normalized PBDE concentrations, respectively, in paired sucker samples from both studies.


Figure 10. Total PBDE Concentrations in Largescale Suckers (whole body) Collected from the Spokane River in 2005 and 2009.


Figure 11. Total Lipid-normalized PBDE Concentrations in Largescale Suckers (whole body) Collected from the Spokane River in 2005 and 2009.

Wet weight PBDE concentrations were lower in all 2009 samples except the two smallest (length) composites from Lower Long Lake. The general decrease in concentrations could not be reconciled by changes in fish size or lipid concentrations alone. The RPD in lengths of the paired samples was low (average 2\%). Average percent lipids in suckers from the fall 2005 collection effort was $5.71 \%$, compared to a $4.77 \%$ average during the spring 2009 collection. Lipid-normalized concentrations were lower in 13 of the 18 paired samples, reducing the strength of the declining trend.

Figure 12 presents percent change in total and lipid-normalized concentrations for paired largescale sucker samples at each reach.


Figure 12. Percent Change in Total PBDEs and Lipid-normalized Total PBDEs in Suckers at Six Spokane River Reaches between 2005 and 2009.

On average, wet weight PBDEs in paired samples were approximately $40 \%$ lower in the 2009 samples. Lipid-normalized concentrations decreased, on average, $24 \%$ in the paired samples. Lower Long Lake was the only reach that did not display consistent declines in total and lipidnormalized concentrations. Concentrations at this reach displayed a $22 \%$ and $42 \%$ average increase in wet weight and lipid-normalized concentrations, respectively.

Conflicting trend directions were observed between wet weight and lipid-normalized concentrations in single composites from Lower Long Lake, Nine Mile, and Stateline. Percent lipids in these composites were lower than the group mean in all three instances, resulting in elevated normalized concentrations.

## Mountain Whitefish

Changes in PBDE concentrations were also examined in 5 mountain whitefish fillet composites from 3 reaches. Figures 13 and 14 present wet weight and lipid-normalized concentrations from both study years.


Figure 13. Total PBDE Concentrations in Mountain Whitefish (fillet) Collected from the Spokane River in 2005 and 2009.


Figure 14. Total Lipid-normalized PBDE Concentrations in Mountain Whitefish (fillet) Collected from the Spokane River in 2005 and 2009.

Wet weight values indicated a decreasing trend while lipid-normalized values show PBDE concentrations increasing. Changes in fillet concentrations appeared to be strongly affected by percent lipids. Fillet samples taken during the current 2009 survey were severely depleted of lipids when compared to the 2005 study.

## Reduced PBDE Tissue Concentrations

Large decreases in concentrations for both species were not expected over such a short time period. Studies assessing biotic trends in PBDE concentrations have overwhelmingly reported rapidly increasing rates (Ikonomou et al., 2002; Lebeuf et al., 2004; Norstrom et al., 2002; Rayne et al., 2003). Gauthier et al. (2008) described a leveling trend in PBDE 47, 99, and 100 since 2000 in herring gull eggs. Decreasing trends (1998-2004) in Lake Ontario lake trout were recently reported by Ismail et al. (2009).

Causes behind the large change in fish tissue concentrations are unknown. Seasonal variation due to changing hydrology and fish physiology may be partly responsible for the declines in wet weight concentrations. On average, percent lipids were lower in both species during the March to April 2009 collection effort. Depleted energy stores at the end of winter have been documented in several fish species (Biro et al., 2004; Cunjak and Power, 1986). Studies examining PBDE elimination under increased lipid metabolism are lacking.

Evidence exists suggesting changing river flows have a large effect on PBDE concentrations in the Spokane River water column. Dissolved PBDE concentrations have been monitored intermittently since 2005 at the Nine Mile Dam, using semi-permeable membrane devices (SPMDs) (Johnson et al., 2006; Sandvik, 2009; Sandvik in prep.) The devices are deployed for approximately 1 month during high and low river flows and can be used to estimate water column concentrations. During fall 2005 and spring 2006, estimated dissolved PBDE water
column concentrations were approximately 6 times greater during the fall ( 926 and $146 \mathrm{pg} / \mathrm{L}$ fall and spring, respectively) (Johnson et al., 2006). The large change in water column concentrations were interpreted as a dilution of local sources in the spring from increased flow due to snowmelt in the upper watershed. SPMD monitoring during 2008 and 2009 showed a similar relationship between season and dissolved water concentrations at Nine Mile Dam (personal communication, Patti Sandvik, ECY).

Tissue collections for the two studies occurred during different seasons and dissimilar river flows. The majority of the 2005 collection effort occurred during August and September. During those two months, flows were low, ranging from 600 - 1900 cfs at the Mission Park site. The 2009 sample collection took place during March and April when flows at the same gage were greater than 5,000 cfs (Figure 15). The effect season and river flow have on tissue PBDE concentration is unknown.


Figure 15. Spokane River Flows during 2005 and 2009 Sampling.

## Conclusions

Results from this 2009 study present one part of a joint effort between Ecology and USGS to examine PBDE concentrations in osprey eggs along the Spokane River. During this study, Ecology measured PBDE concentrations in sportfish and largescale suckers from the Spokane River in order to characterize contaminant concentrations in the diet of osprey nesting along the river. Results from the osprey egg portion of the study will be reported by USGS in 2010.

Ecology sampled 6 river reaches from the Idaho border through Long Lake. Total PBDE concentrations in whole fish composites ranged from $30.6-2,531 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{Kg}$ wet weight. PBDE concentrations were strongly correlated with fish size and age within a specific reach. Percent lipids had a highly variable correlation with PBDE concentrations in whole body largescale sucker samples. Concentrations were generally higher in sportfish than largescale suckers.

The highest PBDE concentrations were found in the lower three stretches beginning at Nine Mile. PBDE levels in largescale sucker composites from Nine Mile were approximately 6 times greater than those from Mission Park, the nearest upstream reach. The large change in concentrations between the two reaches was also noted by Serdar and Johnson (2006) during a 2005 survey. The data suggest major PBDE sources are located in the city of Spokane.

Temporal trends in PBDEs were examined by comparing mountain whitefish and largescale sucker concentrations to those recorded in the 2005 survey. Samples were paired between the two studies according to location and fish composite length. Wet weight concentrations from the 2009 survey were lower in 21 of 23 paired samples, often by greater than 50 percent. The apparent declines in PBDE levels may be associated with seasonal differences in fish physiology and river hydrology during fall and spring sampling events. Despite the lower PBDE levels recorded in 2009, concentrations in Spokane River fish are highly elevated compared to other areas of Washington State.

## Recommendations

As a result of this 2009 study, the following recommendations are made:

- Conduct an investigation to determine PBDE sources to the Spokane River in Idaho and Washington. Source identification should include PBDE analysis of effluent discharged from the Riverside Park Water Reclamation Facility above the Nine Mile stretch.
- Continue to use largescale suckers in fish PBDE monitoring investigations for the Spokane River. The species are abundant throughout the river and represent the largest historical data set for any species. Fish should be collected during the fall low-flow period to determine whether declining contaminant concentrations are the result of environmental conditions.
- Continue SPMD monitoring for PBDEs at the Nine Mile station. Consider adding additional stations upstream.
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## Appendices

## Appendix A. Glossary, Acronyms, and Abbreviations

## Glossary

Bioaccumulation: Progressive increase in the amount of a substance in an organism or part of an organism which occurs because the rate of intake exceeds the organism's ability to remove the substance from the body.

Boxplot: A graphical depiction of a data set showing the $25^{\text {th }}$ percentile, $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile or median, the $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile, range of data, and outliers.

Congener: In chemistry, congeners are related chemicals. For example, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) are a group of 209 related chemicals that are called congeners.

Contaminant: Any physical, chemical, biological, or radiological substance or matter that has an adverse effect on air, water, or soil.

Hydrophobic: Describing the character of a molecule or atomic group which is insoluble in water, or resistant to wetting or hydration.

Lipophilic: Having an affinity for, tending to combine with, or capable of dissolving in lipids.
Octanol-water partition coefficient $\left(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{o w}}\right)$ : Ratio of the concentration of a chemical in octanol and in water at equilibrium and at a specified temperature. The ratio is often used to help predict the extent a contaminant will bioaccumulate in fish.

PBDE flame retardant: A group of organohalogen chemicals added to consumer products so the products will not catch on fire or will burn more slowly if exposed to flame or high heat.

Persistent, bioaccumulative, toxic substance (PBT): A distinct group of chemicals that threaten the health of people and the environment. They 1) remain in the environment for a long time without breaking down (persist), 2) are accumulated by animals and humans and increase in concentration up the food chain (bioaccumulate), and 3) are linked to toxic effects in fish, wildlife, and humans (toxic).

Reach: A specific portion or segment of a stream.
Watershed: A drainage area or basin in which all land and water areas drain or flow toward a central collector such as a stream, river, or lake at a lower elevation.

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

The following are acronyms and abbreviations used frequently in this report.

| BNT | Brown trout |
| :--- | :--- |
| Ecology | Washington State Department of Ecology |
| EIM | Environmental Information Management database |
| EPA | U.S. Environmental Protection Agency |
| LCS | Laboratory control sample |
| LSS | Largescale sucker |
| MEL | Manchester Environmental Laboratory |
| MWF | Mountain whitefish |
| NAD | North American Datum |
| NPM | Northern pikeminnow |
| PBDE | Polybrominated Diphenyl Ethers |
| PBT | Persistent, Bioaccumulative, and Toxic substance |
| RBT | Rainbow trout |
| RCW | Revised Code of Washington |
| RM | River Mile |
| RPD | Relative Percent Difference |
| SMB | Smallmouth bass |
| SOP | Standard Operating Procedures |
| SRM | Standard Reference Materials |
| USGS | U.S. Geological Survey |
| UV | Ultraviolet |
| WRIA | Water Resources Inventory Area |
| WWTP | Wastewater Treatment Plant |
| Units of Measurement |  |
| ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | degrees centigrade |
| cfs | cubic feet per second |
| ft | feet |
| g | gram, a unit of mass |
| kg | kilograms, a unit of mass equal to 1,000 grams. |
| m | meter |
| pg/L | picograms per liter (parts per quadrillion) |
| $\mu g /$ Kg | micrograms per kilogram (parts per billion) |
| ww | wet weight |
|  |  |

## Appendix B. Sampling Locations.

Table B-1. Spokane River Sampling Station Descriptions for the 2009 PBDE Study.

| Spokane River Reach | Collection Date | Description | River Mile | Latitude ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Longitude ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Species |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stateline | 3/4/2009 | Spokane River near <br> Idaho/Washington border | 96.2 | 47.69720 | -117.04133 | Largescale sucker |
| Plante Ferry | 3/4/2009 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Spokane River } \\ \text { near } \\ \text { Plante's Ferry Park } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 84.0-84.2 | 47.69132 | -117.25306 | Largescale sucker Rainbow trout |
| Mission Park | 3/3/2009 | Spokane River near <br> Mission Park | 75.1-78.0 | 47.66461 | -117.4047 | Largescale sucker Mountain whitefish |
| Nine Mile | 4/7/2009 | Spokane River near <br> Plese Flats at Riverside State Park | 63.1-64.0 | 47.73073 | -117.51046 | Largescale sucker Mountain whitefish |
|  |  |  | 56.5-57.1 | 47.79274 | -117.53435 | Mountain whitefish |
| Upper Long Lake | 4/7/2009 | Spokane River near <br> Upper Long Lake | 54.0-54.1 | 47.79447 | -117.57636 | Largescale sucker <br> Northern pikeminnow Smallmouth bass |
| Lower Long Lake | 4/8/2009 | Spokane River near Lower Long Lake | 38.8-39.6 | 47.83137 | -117.76374 | Largescale sucker Northern pikeminnow |

${ }^{a}$ NAD83 Datum.

Table B-2. Sampling Station Descriptions of Reference Waterbodies for the 2009 PBDE Study.

| Reference <br> Waterbody | Collection <br> Date | Description | Latitude $^{\mathrm{a}}$ | Longitude $^{\mathrm{a}}$ | Species |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rock Lake | $4 / 6 / 2009$ | Rock Lake <br> near <br> west shore of lake | 47.18209 | -117.68518 | Brown trout |
| Williams Lake | $4 / 8 / 2009$ | Williams Lake <br> near <br> southwest shoreline of lake | 47.32234 | -117.69549 | Rainbow trout |

[^0]
## Appendix C. Data Quality

Table C-1. PBDE Laboratory Method Blanks. Bolded values indicate detections.

| B09E072-BLK1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Congener | Result <br> $(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{Kg})$ | Qualifier |
| PBDE-047 | 0.22 | U |
| PBDE-049 | 0.22 | U |
| PBDE-066 | 0.22 | U |
| PBDE-071 | 0.22 | U |
| PBDE-099 | 0.22 | U |
| PBDE-100 | 0.22 | U |
| PBDE-138 | 0.44 | U |
| PBDE-153 | 0.44 | U |
| PBDE-154 | 0.44 | U |
| PBDE-183 | 0.44 | U |
| PBDE-184 | 0.44 | U |
| PBDE-191 | 0.44 | U |
| PBDE-209 | 12.8 | J |


| B09E075-BLK1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Congener | Result <br> $(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{Kg})$ | Qualifier |
| PBDE-047 | 0.22 | U |
| PBDE-049 | 0.22 | $U$ |
| PBDE-066 | 0.22 | $U$ |
| PBDE-071 | 0.22 | $U$ |
| PBDE-099 | 0.22 | $U$ |
| PBDE-100 | 0.22 | $U$ |
| PBDE-138 | 0.44 | $U$ |
| PBDE-153 | 0.44 | $U$ |
| PBDE-154 | 0.44 | $U$ |
| PBDE-183 | 0.44 | $U$ |
| PBDE-184 | 0.44 | $U$ |
| PBDE-191 | 0.44 | $U$ |
| PBDE-209 | 1.38 |  |


| B09E135-BLK1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Congener | Result <br> $(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{Kg})$ | Qualifier |
| PBDE-047 | 0.20 | U |
| PBDE-049 | 0.20 | $U$ |
| PBDE-066 | 0.20 | $U$ |
| PBDE-071 | 0.20 | $U$ |
| PBDE-099 | 0.20 | $U$ |
| PBDE-100 | 0.20 | $U$ |
| PBDE-138 | 0.40 | $U$ |
| PBDE-153 | 0.40 | $U$ |
| PBDE-154 | 0.40 | $U$ |
| PBDE-183 | 0.40 | $U$ |
| PBDE-184 | 0.40 | $U$ |
| PBDE-191 | 0.40 | $U$ |
| PBDE-209 | 1.00 | $U J$ |


| B09F210-BLK1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Congener | Result <br> $(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{Kg})$ | Qualifier |
| PBDE-047 | 0.44 | U |
| PBDE-049 | 0.44 | U |
| PBDE-066 | 0.44 | $U$ |
| PBDE-071 | 0.44 | $U$ |
| PBDE-099 | 0.44 | $U$ |
| PBDE-100 | 0.44 | $U$ |
| PBDE-138 | 0.89 | $U$ |
| PBDE-153 | 0.89 | $U$ |
| PBDE-154 | 0.89 | $U$ |
| PBDE-183 | 0.89 | $U$ |
| PBDE-184 | 0.89 | $U$ |
| PBDE-191 | 0.89 | $U$ |
| PBDE-209 | 2.20 | $U J$ |

[^1]Table C-2. PBDE Laboratory Control Samples.

| B09E072-BS1 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Congener | Recovery <br> $(\%)$ |
| PBDE-047 | 69 |
| PBDE-049 | 67 |
| PBDE-066 | 74 |
| PBDE-071 | 68 |
| PBDE-099 | 82 |
| PBDE-100 | 79 |
| PBDE-138 | 102 |
| PBDE-153 | 94 |
| PBDE-154 | 74 |
| PBDE-183 | 99 |
| PBDE-184 | 89 |
| PBDE-191 | 109 |
| PBDE-209 | 127 |


| B09E075-BS1 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Congener | Recovery <br> $(\%)$ |
| PBDE-047 | 98 |
| PBDE-049 | 99 |
| PBDE-066 | 98 |
| PBDE-071 | 100 |
| PBDE-099 | 100 |
| PBDE-100 | 99 |
| PBDE-138 | 102 |
| PBDE-153 | 102 |
| PBDE-154 | 101 |
| PBDE-183 | 105 |
| PBDE-184 | 101 |
| PBDE-191 | 104 |
| PBDE-209 | 77 |


| B09E135-BS1 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Congener | Recovery <br> $(\%)$ |
| PBDE-047 | 76 |
| PBDE-049 | 78 |
| PBDE-066 | 76 |
| PBDE-071 | 77 |
| PBDE-099 | 75 |
| PBDE-100 | 75 |
| PBDE-138 | 74 |
| PBDE-153 | 77 |
| PBDE-154 | 80 |
| PBDE-183 | 77 |
| PBDE-184 | 78 |
| PBDE-191 | 73 |
| PBDE-209 | 51 |


| B09F210-BS1 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Congener | Recovery <br> $(\%)$ |
| PBDE-047 | 86 |
| PBDE-049 | 86 |
| PBDE-066 | 86 |
| PBDE-071 | 84 |
| PBDE-099 | 90 |
| PBDE-100 | 85 |
| PBDE-138 | 105 |
| PBDE-153 | 106 |
| PBDE-154 | 85 |
| PBDE-183 | 100 |
| PBDE-184 | 95 |
| PBDE-191 | 105 |
| PBDE-209 | 77 |

Table C-3. PBDE Standard Reference Material Samples.

| B09E072-SRM1 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Congener | Recovery <br> $(\%)$ |
| PBDE-047 | 79 |
| PBDE-099 | 105 |
| PBDE-153 | 96 |


| B09E075-SRM1 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Congener | Recovery <br> $(\%)$ |
| PBDE-047 | 104 |
| PBDE-099 | 111 |
| PBDE-153 | 74 |


| B09E135-SRM1 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Congener | Recovery <br> $(\%)$ |
| PBDE-047 | 74 |
| PBDE-099 | 76 |
| PBDE-153 | 52 |


| B09F210-SRM1 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Congener | Recovery <br> $(\%)$ |
| PBDE-047 | 96 |
| PBDE-099 | 110 |
| PBDE-153 | 93 |

Table C-4. PBDE Laboratory Matrix Spikes.

| B09E072-MS1 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Congener | Recovery <br> $(\%)$ |
| PBDE-047 | NC |
| PBDE-049 | 77 |
| PBDE-066 | 110 |
| PBDE-071 | 81 |
| PBDE-099 | 112 |
| PBDE-100 | NC |
| PBDE-138 | 156 |
| PBDE-153 | 135 |
| PBDE-154 | 79 |
| PBDE-183 | 163 |
| PBDE-184 | 138 |
| PBDE-191 | 194 |
| PBDE-209 | 237 |


| B09E075-MS1 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Congener | Recovery <br> $(\%)$ |
| PBDE-047 | 99 |
| PBDE-049 | 100 |
| PBDE-066 | 103 |
| PBDE-071 | 98 |
| PBDE-099 | 110 |
| PBDE-100 | 104 |
| PBDE-138 | 109 |
| PBDE-153 | 107 |
| PBDE-154 | 101 |
| PBDE-183 | 110 |
| PBDE-184 | 102 |
| PBDE-191 | 112 |
| PBDE-209 | 98 |


| B09E135-MS1 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Congener | Recovery <br> $(\%)$ |
| PBDE-047 | NC |
| PBDE-049 | 82 |
| PBDE-066 | 103 |
| PBDE-071 | 105 |
| PBDE-099 | 75 |
| PBDE-100 | NC |
| PBDE-138 | 85 |
| PBDE-153 | 87 |
| PBDE-154 | 84 |
| PBDE-183 | 85 |
| PBDE-184 | 82 |
| PBDE-191 | 87 |
| PBDE-209 | 46 |

[^2]Table C-5. PBDE Laboratory Duplicates. Bolded values indicated detections.

| $0905034-05$ |  |  | B09E072-DUP1 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Congener | Result <br> $(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{Kg})$ | Qualifier | Congener | Result <br> $(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{Kg})$ | Qualifier |  |
| PBDE-047 | $\mathbf{7 7}$ |  | PBDE-047 | $\mathbf{6 8}$ | J | 12 |
| PBDE-049 | 4.4 | U | PBDE-049 | $\mathbf{0 . 8 9}$ | J | --- |
| PBDE-066 | 4.4 | U | PBDE-066 | 0.89 | U | 0 |
| PBDE-071 | 4.4 | U | PBDE-071 | 0.89 | U | 0 |
| PBDE-099 | 4.4 | U | PBDE-099 | 0.89 | U | 0 |
| PBDE-100 | $\mathbf{1 4}$ |  | PBDE-100 | $\mathbf{1 3 . 7}$ | J | 2 |
| PBDE-138 | 8.8 | U | PBDE-138 | 1.8 | U | 0 |
| PBDE-153 | $\mathbf{2 . 7}$ | J | PBDE-153 | $\mathbf{1 . 9}$ | J | 37 |
| PBDE-154 | $\mathbf{5 . 3}$ | J | PBDE-154 | $\mathbf{4 . 3}$ | J | 20 |
| PBDE-183 | 8.8 | U | PBDE-183 | 1.8 | U | 0 |
| PBDE-184 | 8.8 | U | PBDE-184 | 1.8 | U | 0 |
| PBDE-191 | 8.8 | U | PBDE-191 | 1.8 | U | 0 |
| PBDE-209 | 22 | U | PBDE-209 | 13 | UJ | 0 |


| 0905034-43 |  |  | B09E135-DUP1 |  |  | RPD (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Congener | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Result } \\ (\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{Kg}) \end{array}$ | Qualifier | Congener | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Result } \\ & (\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{Kg}) \end{aligned}$ | Qualifier |  |
| PBDE-047 | 70 |  | PBDE-047 | 71 |  | 2 |
| PBDE-049 | 5.3 |  | PBDE-049 | 5.3 |  | 1 |
| PBDE-066 | 0.4 | U | PBDE-066 | 0.39 | U | 0 |
| PBDE-071 | 0.4 | U | PBDE-071 | 0.39 | U | 0 |
| PBDE-099 | 0.4 | U | PBDE-099 | 0.39 | U | 0 |
| PBDE-100 | 17 |  | PBDE-100 | 17 |  | 2 |
| PBDE-138 | 0.8 | U | PBDE-138 | 0.78 | U | 0 |
| PBDE-153 | 1.1 |  | PBDE-153 | 1.1 |  | 2 |
| PBDE-154 | 4.6 |  | PBDE-154 | 4.7 |  | 2 |
| PBDE-183 | 0.8 | U | PBDE-183 | 0.78 | U | 0 |
| PBDE-184 | 0.8 | U | PBDE-184 | 0.78 | U | 0 |
| PBDE-191 | 0.8 | U | PBDE-191 | 0.78 | U | 0 |
| PBDE-209 | 4.8 | UJ | PBDE-209 | 2.0 | UJ | 0 |


| $0905034-25$ |  | B09E075-DUP1 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Congener | Result <br> $(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{Kg})$ | Qualifier | Congener |  | Qualifier | RPD (\%)

RPD - Relative percent difference.
U - undetected at the level indicated.
J - estimated value.

Table C-6. Lipid Laboratory Method Blanks. Bolded values indicate detections.

| Sample Number | Result <br> $(\%)$ | Qualifier |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B09E074-BLK1 | 0.01 | U |
| B09E076-BLK1 | $\mathbf{0 . 0 2}$ |  |
| B09E134-BLK1 | 0.01 | U |

U - undetected at the level indicated.

Table C-7. Lipid Laboratory Duplicates.

| Sample Number | Result <br> (\%) | RPD (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0905034-05 | 6.69 | 9.0 |
| B09E074-DUP1 | 6.12 |  |


| Sample Number | Result <br> $(\%)$ | RPD <br> $(\%)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0905034-43 | 4.21 | 4.0 |
| B09E134-DUP1 | 4.36 |  |


| Sample Number | Result <br> $(\%)$ | RPD <br> $(\%)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B09E076-DUP1 <br> $0905034-25$ | 1.3 | 1.44 |

RPD = Relative Percent Difference

## Appendix D. Fish Biological Data

Table D-1. Composite Fish Data by Spokane River Reach, 2009.

| Spokane River Reach | River Mile | Sample ID | Species | No. of Individuals per Sample | Mean <br> Length (mm) | Mean Weight (g) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mean } \\ & \text { Age } \end{aligned}$ | Tissue Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stateline | 96.2 | 0905034-01 | LSS | 3 | 451 | 1112 | 8.67 | Whole |
|  |  | 0905034-02 | LSS | 3 | 476 | 1127 | 9.67 | Whole |
|  |  | 0905034-03 | LSS | 4 | 520 | 1565 | 13.5 | Whole |
| Plante Ferry | 84.0-84.2 | 0905034-04 | LSS | 3 | 470 | 1139 | 8.33 | Whole |
|  |  | 0905034-05 | LSS | 4 | 488 | 1322 | 9.5 | Whole |
|  |  | 0905034-06 | LSS | 5 | 529 | 1643 | 12 | Whole |
|  |  | 0905034-19 | RBT | 3 | 400 | 578 | 3 | Fillet |
|  |  | 0905034-20 | RBT | 3 | 400 | 578 | 3 | Carcass |
| Mission Park | 75.1-78.0 | 0905034-07 | LSS | 3 | 421 | 850 | 8 | Whole |
|  |  | 0905034-08 | LSS | 5 | 456 | 1029 | 12.4 | Whole |
|  |  | 0905034-09 | LSS | 4 | 490 | 1226 | 11.5 | Whole |
|  |  | 0905034-21 | MWF | 4 | 370 | 434 | 9.75 | Fillet |
|  |  | 0905034-22 | MWF | 4 | 370 | 434 | 9.75 | Carcass |
| Nine Mile | 63.1-64.0 | 0905034-10 | LSS | 3 | 398 | 832 | 7 | Whole |
|  |  | 0905034-11 | LSS | 3 | 455 | 959 | 9 | Whole |
|  |  | 0905034-12 | LSS | 3 | 487 | 1120 | 11.67 | Whole |
|  |  | 0905034-26 | MWF | 3 | 280 | 195 | 4 | Fillet |
|  |  | 0905034-27 | MWF | 3 | 280 | 195 | 4 | Carcass |
|  |  | 0905034-28 | MWF | 3 | 322 | 284 | 6 | Fillet |
|  |  | 0905034-29 | MWF | 3 | 322 | 284 | 6 | Carcass |
|  |  | 0905034-30 | MWF | 3 | 341 | 318 | 7 | Fillet |
|  |  | 0905034-31 | MWF | 3 | 341 | 318 | 7 | Carcass |
| Upper Long Lake | 56.5-57.1 | 0905034-13 | LSS | 3 | 438 | 955 | 11 | Whole |
|  |  | 0905034-14 | LSS | 4 | 468 | 1218 | 14.5 | Whole |
|  |  | 0905034-15 | LSS | 5 | 487 | 1365 | 13.6 | Whole |
|  |  | 0905034-32 | SMB | 3 | 347 | 623 | 5.67 | Fillet |
|  |  | 0905034-34 | SMB | 2 | 478 | 1886 | 11 | Fillet |
|  |  | 0905034-35 | MWF | 4 | 278 | 175 | 2.5 | Fillet |
|  |  | 0905034-36 | MWF | 4 | 278 | 175 | 2.5 | Carcass |
|  |  | 0905034-37 | MWF | 5 | 320 | 253 | 6 | Fillet |
|  |  | 0905034-38 | MWF | 5 | 320 | 253 | 6 | Carcass |
|  |  | 0905034-39 | NPM | 5 | 381 | 488 | 11.8 | Whole |
|  |  | 0905034-40 | NPM | 4 | 418 | 661 | 13.25 | Whole |
|  |  | 0905034-41 | NPM | 4 | 449 | 813 | 14 | Whole |
| Lower Long Lake | 38.8-39.6 | 0905034-16 | LSS | 3 | 411 | 847 | 6 | Whole |
|  |  | 0905034-17 | LSS | 5 | 462 | 1131 | 13.8 | Whole |
|  |  | 0905034-18 | LSS | 5 | 493 | 1328 | 14 | Whole |
|  |  | 0905034-42 | NPM | 4 | 378 | 498 | 11.25 | Whole |
|  |  | 0905034-43 | NPM | 4 | 404 | 601 | 11.5 | Whole |
|  |  | 0905034-44 | NPM | 3 | 427 | 695 | 12.33 | Whole |

Table D-2. Composite Fish Data by Reference Waterbody, 2009.

| Reference <br> Waterbody | Sample ID | Species | No. of <br> Individuals <br> per Sample | Mean <br> Length <br> $(\mathrm{mm})$ | Mean <br> Weight <br> $(\mathrm{g})$ | Mean <br> Age | Tissue <br> Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $0905034-23$ | RBT | 4 | 393 | 644 | 2 | Whole |
|  | $0905034-24$ | BNT | 5 | 366 | 398 | 2 | Whole |
| Williams Lake | $0905034-25$ | RBT | 5 | 270 | 213 | 1.4 | Whole |

## Appendix E. Linear Regressions



Figure E-1. Simple Linear Regression Plots for Total PBDEs (ppb ww) and Percent Lipids in Largescale Sucker Tissue.


Figure E-2. Simple Linear Regression Plots for Total PBDEs (ppb ww) and Largescale Sucker Total Length (mm).


Figure E-3. Simple Linear Regression Plots for Total PBDEs (ppb ww) and Largescale Sucker Total Weight (g).


Figure E-4. Simple Linear Regression Plots for Total PBDEs (ppb ww) and Largescale Sucker Age (years).

## Appendix F. Temporal Trends

Table F-1. Summary of Differences in Largescale Sucker PBDE Concentrations between 2005 and 2009 (Current) Studies.

| Station | 2005 Study |  |  |  |  | Current Study (2009) |  |  |  |  | \% <br> Change in Total PBDEs | Increase <br> (+) or Decrease (-) | \% Change in Lipidnormalized PBDEs | Increase <br> (+) or Decrease (-) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RPD } \\ & \text { in } \\ & \text { Length } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sample ID | Fish Length (mm) | Fish Lipids (\%) | Total PBDEs ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ww) | Lipidnormalized Total PBDEs ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{Kg}$ lipid) | Sample ID | Fish <br> Length (mm) | Fish Lipids (\%) | Total PBDEs ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ww) | Lipidnormalized Total PBDEs ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{Kg}$ lipid) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stateline | 05494247 | 444 | 10.36 | 214.4 | 2069.4 | 0905034-01 | 451 | 6.98 | 81.6 | 1168.9 | 61.9\% | - | 43.5\% | - | 1.5\% |
|  | 05494246 | 470 | 9.63 | 168.7 | 1752.0 | 0905034-02 | 476 | 6.82 | 107.6 | 1577.7 | 36.2\% | - | 9.9\% | - | 1.2\% |
|  | 05494245 | 516 | 10.13 | 212.1 | 2093.6 | 0905034-03 | 520 | 4.45 | 155.9 | 3503.4 | 26.5\% | - | 67.3\% | + | 0.7\% |
| Plante Ferry | 05494250 | 451 | 6.25 | 83.5 | 1336.0 | 0905034-04 | 470 | 5.91 | 72.6 | 1228.4 | 13.1\% | - | 8.1\% | - | 4.2\% |
|  | 05494248 | 532 | 4.80 | 252.2 | 5254.2 | 0905034-06 | 529 | 4.65 | 98.0 | 2107.5 | 61.1\% | - | 59.9\% | - | 0.6\% |
|  | 05494249 | 484 | 6.06 | 127.7 | 2107.3 | 0905034-05 | 488 | 6.69 | 99.0 | 1479.8 | 22.5\% | - | 29.8\% | - | 0.7\% |
| Mission Park | 05494253 | 414 | 3.69 | 89.5 | 2425.5 | 0905034-07 | 421 | 4.30 | 30.6 | 711.6 | 65.8\% | - | 70.7\% | - | 1.8\% |
|  | 05494251 | 501 | 3.04 | 97.8 | 3217.1 | 0905034-09 | 490 | 2.77 | 33.1 | 1194.9 | 66.2\% | - | 62.9\% | - | 2.3\% |
|  | 05494252 | 455 | 4.76 | 96.6 | 2029.4 | 0905034-08 | 456 | 3.23 | 36.0 | 1114.6 | 62.7\% | - | 45.1\% | - | 0.2\% |
| Nine Mile^ | 05494257/58* | 441 | 3.75 | 333.7 | 8898.7 | 0905034-11 | 455 | 3.02 | 130.0 | 4305.3 | 61.0\% | - | 51.6\% | - | 3.2\% |
|  | 05494260 | 405 | 5.17 | 522.9 | 10114.1 | 0905034-10 | 398 | 4.54 | 145.2 | 3198.2 | 72.2\% | - | 68.4\% | - | 1.7\% |
|  | 05494259 | 425 | 4.61 | 708.3 | 15364.4 | 0905034-12 | 487 | 1.82 | 348.3 | 19136.8 | 50.8\% | - | 24.6\% | + | 13.7\% |
| Upper Long Lake | 05494254 | 438 | 3.54 | 537.9 | 15194.9 | 0905034-13 | 438 | 4.11 | 143.1 | 3481.5 | 73.4\% | - | 77.1\% | - | 0.1\% |
|  | 05494255 | 461 | 4.42 | 718.0 | 16244.3 | 0905034-14 | 468 | 4.70 | 253.5 | 5393.6 | 64.7\% | - | 66.8\% | - | 1.5\% |
|  | 05494256 | 487 | 3.88 | 458.9 | 11827.3 | 0905034-15 | 487 | 7.10 | 313.9 | 4421.3 | 31.6\% | - | 62.6\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Lower Long Lake | 05494243 | 407 | 5.16 | 89.8 | 1740.3 | 0905034-16 | 411 | 5.75 | 124.7 | 2168.7 | 38.9\% | + | 24.6\% | + | 1.0\% |
|  | 05494242 | 491 | 6.40 | 147.9 | 2310.9 | 0905034-18 | 493 | 4.24 | 162.8 | 3839.6 | 10.1\% | + | 66.1\% | + | 0.3\% |
|  | 05494244 | 460 | 7.05 | 357.4 | 5069.5 | 0905034-17 | 462 | 4.70 | 319.9 | 6806.4 | 10.5\% | - | 34.3\% | + | 0.4\% |

* calculated whole fish value.
$\wedge$ bridgelip suckers were collected for the 2005 study.
$R P D=$ relative percent difference.

Table F-2. Summary of Differences in Mountain Whitefish PBDE Concentrations between 2005 and 2009 (Current) Studies.

| Station | 2005 Study |  |  |  |  | Current Study (2009) |  |  |  |  | \% Change in Total PBDEs | Increase <br> $(+)$ or Decrease $(-)$ | \% Change in Lipidnormalized PBDEs | Increase <br> (+) or Decrease $(-)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RPD } \\ & \text { in } \\ & \text { Length } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sample ID | Fish length (mm) | Fish lipids (\%) | Total PBDEs ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ww) | Lipidnormalized Total PBDEs ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{Kg}$ lipid) | Sample ID | Fish <br> Length (mm) | Fish lipids (\%) | Total PBDEs ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{Kg}$ ww) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Lipid- } \\ \text { normalized } \\ \text { Total } \\ \text { PBDEs } \\ (\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{Kg} \\ \text { lipid }) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mission Park | 5494266 | 374 | 6.69 | 355 | 5306.4 | 0905034-21 | 370 | 1.72 | 249.3 | 14494.2 | 29.8\% | - | 173.1\% | + | 1.0\% |
| Nine Mile | 5494267 | 292 | 3.80 | 905.1 | 23818.4 | 0905034-26 | 280 | 1.08 | 397.59 | 36813.9 | 56.1\% | - | 54.6\% | + | 4.1\% |
|  | 5494268 | 321 | 3.59 | 1049.1 | 29222.8 | 0905034-28 | 322 | 1.36 | 615.55 | 45261.0 | 41.3\% | - | 54.9\% | + | 0.2\% |
| Upper Long Lake | 5494240 | 282 | 2.56 | 167 | 6523.4 | 0905034-35 | 278 | 0.28 | 149.8 | 53500.0 | 10.3\% | - | 720.1\% | + | 1.6\% |
|  | 5494239 | 318 | 2.90 | 198.2 | 6834.5 | 0905034-37 | 320 | 0.14 | 196.2 | 140142.9 | 1.0\% | - | 1950.5\% | + | 0.6\% |

RPD - relative percent difference.


[^0]:    ${ }^{a}$ NAD83 Datum.

[^1]:    U - undetected at the level indicated.
    UJ - undetected; detection limit is estimated.
    $J$ - estimated value.

[^2]:    $N C=$ Not Calculated. Native sample contained high level of analyte (3X greater or more); the difference between spiked and native values was not great enough to determine an accurate recovery.

