

Geographic Review Panel 1 – Bay Delta

Proposal number: 2001-F205 **Short Proposal Title:** The Brake Pad Partnership Project:
Reducing Trace Metals at Their Source.

- 1. Applicability to CALFED ERP Goals and Implementation Plan and CVPIA priorities, and relevance to ERP and CVPIA priorities for your region.** This proposal would be generally applicable to the Delta if the project could demonstrate the harmful effects of brake pad debris in urban storm drain runoff. If brake pad debris could be implicated as a source of heavy metal contamination, the subsequent reduction in this debris would support ERP Goal 6. Further, this action would support the CALFED Strategic objective to reduce the concentration and loading of contaminants in all aquatic environments in the Bay-Delta watershed. The CALFED Water Quality Program Plan Draft Programmatic EIS/EIR Technical Appendix urges participation with municipalities on the Brake Pad Consortium; this Consortium is the Brake Pad Partnership Project (BPPP), the principal collaborator in this proposal. Reduction in heavy metal contamination in urban storm drain runoff in the Delta would support the CVPIA Revised Draft Restoration Plan for the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program, Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Evaluation 7 (medium priority).
- 2. Linkages/coordination with previously funded projects or other restoration activities in your region.** The proposal does not identify any such linkages/coordination. The obvious linkages would be with projects aimed at improving the survival of aquatic food chain organisms susceptible to heavy metal pollution in the Delta. However, no studies to date have firmly identified an association between copper pollution and aquatic resource population declines in the Delta.
- 3. Feasibility, especially the project's ability to move forward in a timely and successful manner.** The feasibility of the project is unclear. The conceptual model is not discussed in detail; it is referenced in Figure 1, but the figure is not included in the proposal. Similarly, the annual time-line with proposed start and stop dates and accomplishments of major milestones is referenced in Figure 2, but that figure is also not included in the proposal. The estimated time to develop the brakepad wear test (January 2003) seems unnecessarily protracted.
- 4. Qualifications of the applicants and others involved in implementing the proposed project.** The chief scientist seems qualified. It is unclear exactly how the coalition of participants will work, how disputes will be addressed/resolved, and precise roles of the senior project manager and the project scientist. The composition of the BPP appears sufficiently broad and representative of the special interests at large.
- 5. Local involvement (including environmental compliance).** Although the text indicates the BPPP was listed by the Natural Resources Council as an example of a successful program promoting public education and participation, the program is not formally described. The BPPP will continue to host an annual meeting of interested stakeholders, and will continue to post information on the BPPP web site, and will prepare two articles for Sustainable Conservation's newsletter. This proposal has received considerable support from environmentalists but the extent to which brake pad debris

contributes to copper pollution in the Delta has not yet been conclusively demonstrated. The brake pad manufacturers appear to be cooperating principally because the consequence of protracted litigation is more onerous than voluntary participation in an activity that could result in revising the manufacture of brake pads.

Continuation of outreach currently taking place.

6. Cost. The costs to develop a brake pad test (approximately \$302,000) seems excessive. Total funding for this proposal is not secured. The text is inconsistent in describing the need for additional funds. The proposal indicates that Sustainable Conservation plans to raise \$60,000 (approximately 1/5 of the total program cost); the San Francisco Foundation has committed \$6,000 and previous funders as well as private foundations will be solicited for the remaining \$54,000. If this supplemental funding cannot be secured, the project may not meet its projected timeline.

7. Cost sharing. The San Francisco Foundation will contribute \$6,000, Sustainable Conservation will attempt to raise an additional \$54,000 (not guaranteed).

8. Additional comments. The sequence of events and the process by which actions are completed is insufficiently described. The process to be followed in developing the brake pad debris test seems unnecessarily complicated. Associations between program elements are inadequately described. Program costs seem to be excessively high, and the justification for these cost estimates is lacking.

May be other more appropriate funding sources.

The partnership should meet quarterly instead of annually to adequately incorporate their concerns.

Regional Ranking

Panel Ranking: Medium Low

Provide a brief explanation of your ranking:

The TARP ranked this proposal Poor. The proposal feasibility is unclear/missing. The applicability to CALFED ERP and CVPIA goals is uncertain, based on whether copper pollution in the Delta can be demonstrated. Linkages to other projects in the Delta is similarly uncertain.