

CBP Water Quality Goal Implementation Team
Toxic Contaminants Workgroup
Meeting Agenda

Date: Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Time: 1:00 - 3:00 PM

Location: Conference Call, Room 305 at CBPO

Call-in: 1-929-205-6099; **Code:** 574-130-465

Zoom Link: <https://zoom.us/j/574130465>

Calendar Page: [Link](#).



Chesapeake Bay Program
A Watershed Partnership

Agenda Item and Desired Outcome	Time	Background Docs, Notes, and Action Items
<p>1. Introductions and Announcements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval of the December meeting minutes • New WQGIT co- chairs, and vice- chair • GIT funded projects – it’s not too early to start thinking of ideas! • EPA announced a grant competition to fund 2-year Pollution Prevention (P2) assistance agreements for projects that provide technical assistance (e.g., information, training, tools, etc.) to businesses/facilities to help them develop and adopt source reduction practices. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Request for applications can be found here. ▪ Applications are due Tuesday, March 31, 2020. ▪ Informational webinars about the grant: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FY20-21 RFA Informational Webinar, February 19th, 11-12 PM: • FY20-21 National Emphasis Areas, February 25th, 11-12 PM: • PSU released new research on emerging contaminants in PA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Flow rates and time of year must be taken into account to better understand the potential risks posed by emerging organic contaminants in rivers and streams, according to Penn State researchers who studied contaminant concentrations and flow characteristics at six locations near drinking water intakes in the Susquehanna River basin on emerging contaminants in PA.” 	<p>1:00</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scott Phillips will present the Final STAC report to the TCW at the February 2020 meeting • Update the Mercury Story Map and complete the Mercury Story Map documentation • Complete the toxic contaminant indicator • TCW members should email Greg Allen (allen.greg@epa.gov) and Hilary Swartwood (swartwood.hilary@epa.gov) if interested in participating in the PCB Consortium Exploratory Team. • Jurisdictions will help provide the final User Guide for Fish Consumption to relevant agencies, local governments, etc. for them to use and distribute. • PPAT: reach out to Emily Trentacoste for more info / join team.
<p>2. SRS Review Planning for 2020– Greg Allen, EPA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of TCW strategies and logic and action plans: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Policy and Prevention – Greg Allen, EPA, and Emily Majcher, USGS ii. Research – Scott Phillips, USGS and Emily Majcher, USGS • Timeline for 2020 review – Greg Allen, EPA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Face – to – face meeting (April / May / June)? 	<p>1:15</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TCW Logic and Action Plans • TCW SRS Review Schedule

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responsibilities of TCW and next steps – Greg Allen, EPA, and Scott Phillips, USGS 		
3. A. Final report for STAC Workshop on Toxic Contaminants in Agriculture and Urban Settings; B. Feedback on initial response of CBP to STAC – Scott Phillips, USGS and Emily Majcher, USGS	2:15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final Report
4. TCW Meeting Schedule – Greg Allen, EPA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> March meeting cancelled 	2:45	
5. Wrap Up and Adjourn	2:55	Next meeting: Wednesday April 8, 2020

Summary of Actions and Decisions

Decision: The TCW approved the December meeting minutes.

Action: Hilary Swartwood will add PSU presentation on emerging contaminants in PA and USGS presentation on PFAS to the TCW planning calendar for 2020.

Action: The TCW will provide feedback on CBP’s response to the Final Report for STAC Workshop on Toxic Contaminants in Agriculture and Urban Settings and send responses to Scott Phillips (swphillips@usgs.gov) and Emily Majcher (emajcher@usgs.gov) by end of February. Scott and Emily will use this feedback in the response to CBP.

Action: The TCW leadership will review the Logic and Action Plans after which, Hilary Swartwood will send the plans to the jurisdictions to update. These will be reviewed at the TCW meeting on April 8, 2020.

1. Additional Announcements

- a. Git Funded projects:
 - i. These allow GITs and Workgroups to address gaps.
 - ii. TCW idea for a GIT funded project is a PCB track down study. Potentially, we would ask a contractor to review the Navy document and develop a CBP track down study guidance document. These are not due till April / May so we should start thinking now for next round of ideas (funding is between 30- 100k).
- b. PSU research could be a potential presentation for TCW and should be added to the planning calendar.
- c. If anyone has a strong interest in joining PPAT, reach out to Emily Trentacoste (Trentacoste.emily@epa.gov). The charter will have 2 parts: 1) making progress on ecological risk assessment / find gaps that need to be filled; and 2) keep eye on programs, policies, and opportunities to reduce amount of plastics in the system (ex. Save our Seas law through congress and other significant federal programs to reduce plastic pollution).
- d. USGS is having a workshop on PFAS, although it is internal. However, Scott can have someone speak to group about findings. This should be added to the TCW planning calendar.

Decision: The TCW approved the December meeting minutes.

Action: Hilary Swartwood will add PSU presentation on emerging contaminants in PA and USGS presentation on PFAS to the TCW planning calendar for 2020.

2. SRS Review Planning for 2020

- a. Timeline: Jurisdictions will have 1 month to send updates on progress to the TCW leadership team.

- b. Hilary will post the updated logic and action plans to the TCW meeting page and send them to the jurisdictions.
- c. Is there an efficient way to go about reviewing and updating the plans?
 - i. We could gather from jurisdictions what has been completed by using excel version of the Logic and Action Plans. These would be sent to the jurisdictions / other relevant groups.
- d. Initial thoughts are to have an in person meeting on April 8th or on May 13th. and be ready to talk about strategic shifts. This would involve pulling materials together for review and making sure everyone has access to them. We would also have an in-person meeting closer to August before presenting to the Management Board. This means that all materials should be gathered by mid-March.

Action: The TCW leadership will review the Logic and Action Plans first. After which, Hilary Swartwood will send the plans to the jurisdictions to review. These will be reviewed at the TCW meeting on April 8, 2020.

3. Final Report for STAC Workshop on Toxic Contaminants in Agriculture and Urban Settings / Feedback on initial response of CBP to STAC

- a. The CBP needs to generate a response to STAC in order to raise awareness and how we plan to carry out what we intend to do.
- b. Major take aways:
 - i. Most jurisdictions using local TMDL to address toxic contaminants which are dominated by PCBs.
 - ii. Jurisdictions also use NPDES permits (MS4, Industrial, Individual).
 - iii. Other ways jurisdictions are addressing toxics: DC coal tar sealant ban (PAHs), Anacostia sediment study (megasite), and DE integrated cleanup and TMDL (WATAR).
- c. Emily Majcher discussed the STAC report:
 - i. In urban areas there are opportunities to reduce toxic contaminants. We looked at work being done already and whether this could be used in Chesapeake Bay to remove toxic contaminants from the Bay. We need improved best practices for sources evaluation and conceptual model for management selection (improved communication), and better define the fate and transport of toxic contaminants in different settings including stormwater control structures.
 - 1. Correction from DE: PFAS fish advisory- we do not have this, but NJ does.
- d. Responses from STAC report:
 - i. Potential actions that they would like Bay Program to adopt:
 - 1. Jurisdictions:
 - a. Opportunities to address toxics when implementing Phase 3 WIPs
 - b. Cross- WG work
- e. If you have any feedback regarding CBPs response, please reach out to Scott or Emily by the end of the month.
- f. Initial Responses:
 - i. Fred Pickney: Using the Bay modeling could be really powerful. I'm wondering how much effort it would be.
 - ii. Scott Phillips: We are going to use one of our upcoming calls to get that discussion going.
 - iii. Fred Pickney: Then the modeling group will buy into it because you are using their tool.
 - iv. Tom Parham: There are probably some PCB related things to this, so at least you can match that up with folks doing BMPs.
 - v. Greg Allen: It would be a monumentally difficult task to go through each BMP. We could have STAC help us look at the assumptions we use (ex. BMPs that trap sediments are likely to trap urban contaminants – maybe this hypothesis isn't as accurate as we believe). Perhaps we should look at broad assumptions to target BMPs instead of looking at each individual BMP.

Action: The TCW will provide feedback on CBP's response to the Final Report for STAC Workshop on Toxic Contaminants in Agriculture and Urban Settings and send responses to Scott Phillips (swphillips@usgs.gov) and Emily Majcher (emajcher@usgs.gov) by end of February. Scott and Emily will use this feedback in the response to CBP.

4. TCW Meeting Schedule
5. Wrap Up and Adjourn

Call Participants

Greg Allen, EPA
Hilary Swartwood, CRC
Scott Phillips, USGS
Emily Majcher, USGS
Fred Pickney, USFWS
Amy Williams, PA DEP
Mark Richardson, VA DEQ
John Maleri, DOEE
Doug Austin, CBPO
Dave Whitall, NOAA
Trevor Needham, USGS
Raffi Marano, EPA
Tom Parham, MD DNR
Marel King, CBC
Len Schugam, MDE
Ken Hyer, USGS
Tom Barron, PA DEP