| Date | Meeting or Teleconference | Agenda |
| --- | --- | --- |
| August 20 | Meeting/Teleconference | **HHC 101: Role and Formula (DEC Staff)*** + EPA 2015 Recommended National Criteria
	+ What is going on in other states interested in this issue?

**Issue 1: What information about fish consumption and fish consumption rate is available to inform HHC process?** (DEC Staff)* + What do we know from the Literature Review?
	+ What did the reviewers tell us?
	+ What role should the state play in helping to develop Alaska specific data?
		- Should the state take a prescriptive approach and establish accepted dietary survey protocols for tribes and parties seeking site-specific criteria?
		- Food Frequency Questionnaires v. Recall Method
	+ Can we extrapolate FCR data from ADF&G harvest data?\*
		- Review *Wolfe and Utermohle* (2000)
 |
| Sept 30 | Teleconference/Webinar | **Issue 3: What is the appropriate Level of Protection for Alaska to consider?*** + FCR: Consumers v. consumers and non-consumers
	+ FCR: General v. high exposed population
	+ Other Exposure Factors (DWI, BW, Relative Source Contribution)
	+ Approaches used by other states
 |
| Oct 30 | MeetingNote that this meeting will take place immediately following the Public Workshop in Anchorage | **Issue 4a: What should Alaska include when deriving a Fish Consumption Rate?*** + Sources of fish and shellfish
	+ Local v. commercial
	+ Role of salmon- what OR/WA/ID did and didn’t do
	+ Role of marine mammals- *May be tabled for a later discussion*
	+ Approach(es) used by other states
 |
| December | Teleconference/Webinar | **Issue 4b: What is the role of Relative Source Contribution (RSC) and what are Alaska’s options?** * + Description of RSC
	+ Approaches used by other states
	+ Opportunities for DEC to consider
 |
| January | Teleconference/Webinar | **Issue 2: What options does Alaska have for developing criteria on a statewide/regional/site-specific basis*** + pros/cons
	+ Sources of information
	+ Potential issues for DEC to explore further
	+ Does ADF&G harvest data demonstrate regional trends in FCRs?
 |
| February | Teleconference/Webinar | **Issue 2a: Modeling of the Criteria*** + Deterministic v. Probabilistic (Arcadis Presentation?)
	+ The Florida/Idaho example (FL DEQ)
 |
| March | Teleconference/Webinar | **Issue 3 (revisit): What is the appropriate Level of Protection for Alaska to consider?*** + Bioconcentration v. Bioaccumulation- how does it factor into the HHC process and what flexibility does that process have?
		- Idaho approach (maybe Washington if they have something)
	+ Carcinogenic Risk Factor
		- Controversy in Washington
		- DEC regulations – 18 AAC 70, 18 AAC 75
 |
| April | Meeting or Teleconference/Webinar? | **Issue 5: What are Alaska’s options for implementing the proposed criteria?** * + General Implementation
		- Compliance Schedules
		- Intake Credits
		- Variances
		- Other: SSC/Designated Use revision (Subsistence fishing)
	+ Problematic Discharges\*
		- Arsenic
		- PCBs
		- Mercury
		- Other….
	+ Detection Limit issues- set criterion at MDL or…
	+ Toxics in the larger context
	+ Washington example
 |
| May | Teleconference/Webinar | **First Draft Workgroup Report** |
| July | Teleconference/Webinar | **Draft Final Workgroup Report** |

\*May required additional discussion and representation from other programs