**Mercury Reductions Measured at Wastewater Treatment Facilities Following Implementation of Dental Amalgam Programs [1,2]**

| Agency and Location | Fate of Treated Effluent | Fate of Biosolids | Date of Amalgam Program Implementation | Percent Mercury Reduction |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Central Contra Costa Sanitary District, Martinez, CA[3] | San Francisco Bay; recycled water | Incineration | November 2007 (mandatory program) | 77% (biosolids) |
| King County (Seattle metro area), Washington[4] | Puget Sound | Land application to crops, forests, landscaping | End of 2004 (97% compliance) | 55% (biosolids) |
| Madison Metropolitan Sewerage District , WI[5] | Rock and Mississippi Rivers systems | Field application | December 2008 (mandatory) | 45% (biosolids) |
| Massachusetts Water Resources Authority, Boston, MA[6] | Massachusetts Bay | Pelletized for fertilizer | April 2006 (mandatory, statewide) | 60% (biosolids) |
| Metropolitan Council Environmental Services (Minneapolis / St. Paul, MN)[7] | Mississippi River | Incineration | January 2003 voluntary; later mandatory | 51% (influent) |
| Regional Water Quality Control Plant, Palo Alto, CA[8] | San Francisco Bay; recycled water | Incineration | March 31, 2005 (mandatory) | 63% (biosolids) |
| San Francisco Public Utility Commission[9] | San Francisco Bay and Pacific Ocean; recycled water | Land application and alternative daily cover for landfill | February 2004 (mandatory) | 45% (biosolids) |
| Western Lake Superior Sanitary District, Duluth, MN[10] | St. Louis Bay to Lake Superior | Land application | 2005 (100% voluntary installation) | 62% (biosolids)<br>77% (effluent) |

[1] The information tabulated by Stephanie Hughes, P.E., San Jose, CA, for the Bay Area Pollution Prevention Group (BAPPG), completed January 11, 2011.
[2] These agencies were frequently involved with other programs to reduce mercury in their systems (such as mercury thermometer take-back programs and/or hospital mercury reductions), therefore the reductions are not solely from amalgam separator installations. Agency representatives affirm that dental mercury programs provided the single largest direct impact to their mercury reductions.
[3] As of 2010 versus baseline of 2004, based on electronic communication with Melody LaBella, CCCSD, November 19, 2010
[4] As of 2007-2009 versus baseline dataset from 2000, based on data provided by Patricia Magnuson, King County, December 14, 2010.
[5] As of 2009-2010 versus baseline dataset from 2003-2006, based on electronic communication from Ralph Erickson, MMSD, December 6, 2010
[6] As of 2007-2009 versus baseline of 2000-2001, based on electronic communications from Charles Bering, MWRA, December 21, 2010
[7] As of 2010, versus baseline prior to program issuance, based on electronic communication from Peter Berglund, MCES, January 7, 2011.
[8] As of Fall 2010, based on electronic communication from Karin North, City of Palo Alto, November, 2010
[9] As of 2007 versus a baseline of 2004, based on data provided by Meg Gale, SFPUC, December 8, 2010
[10] Based on electronic communication with Tim Tuominem, WLSSD, December 6, 2010.