This meeting is recorded for internal use to ensure the accuracy of the meeting minutes.

CBP Water Quality Goal Implementation Team
Toxic Contaminants Workgroup
Meeting Agenda

Date: *Wednesday, April 14, 2021*
Time: 1:00 - 3:00 PM
Location: Conference Call (remote only)
Calendar Page: Link.

Chesapeake Bay Program
A Watershed Partnership

Meeting Information*

Meeting link: https://umces.webex.com/umces/j.php?MTID=mb652131fb56271918690029b3d7d2eb0

Meeting number: 120 121 0049

Password: 8294

OR

Phone: 1-408-418-9388 United States Toll

Access code: 120 121 0049

**Please join by either computer audio or phone, not both. Viewing the webinar in the desktop app is recommended over the web browser. If experiencing bandwidth issues, turning off video when not speaking is recommended.*

Agenda Item and Desired Outcome	Time	Background Docs, Notes, and Action Items
1. Introductions and Announcements • WQGIT approved Emily Majcher as new TCW Vice- chair (thank you, Scott!) • Initial PFAS Sampling Results from PA – Emily Majcher i. Published Data Release ii. News Article • Update on STAC PFAS proposal – Scott Phillips • TCW's May meeting is rescheduled for *Wednesday, May 19th from 1:00 – 3:00 PM*.	1:00	• Complete the toxic contaminant indicator • Update the PCB Story Map • Mercury Monitoring Network Follow- up • PFAS STAC Workshop • PCBs in Schools Follow- up
2. Release and Demo of Mercury Story Map – James Willacker, USGS	1:15	• Mercury Story Map • Mercury Paper
3. PCB's in Schools Presentations • **State and Local Level -** Doug Austin, SEE EPA (15 min.) • **Federal Level -** Erin Sullivan, EPA (15 min.)	1:45	• Presentations
4. PCBS in Schools Discussion and Next Steps – Doug Austin, SEE EPA	2:15	
5. Wrap Up and Adjourn	3:00	• ***Next meeting:* May 19, 2021; 1 – 3 PM**

This meeting is recorded for internal use to ensure the accuracy of the meeting minutes.

Summary of Actions and Decisions

Action: TCW members interested in glyphosates (round up) should send any technical resources to Emily Majcher (emajcher@usgs.gov) and Hilary Swartwood (swartwood.hilary@epa.gov). They will add these to the Technical Resource Document.

Action: Hilary Swartwood will provide the Mercury Story Map link to the TCW membership after today's meeting.

Meeting Minutes

1. **Introductions and Announcements**
    a. *Round Up Mini Discussion:* if there is interest in glyphosates etc. send any Chesapeake Bay specific papers/ general papers to Hilary Swartwood and Emily Majcher. They can add them to the living resources document. They are also talking about this at the Chesapeake Pesticide Network as well so any papers would be welcome here too. **Action:** TCW members interested in glyphosates (round up) should send any technical resources to Emily Majcher (emajcher@usgs.gov) and Hilary Swartwood (swartwood.hilary@epa.gov). They will add these to the Technical Resource Document.
    b. *PA PFAS Sampling Results:* there is a map and scale of detections of PFAS across the state and it also includes the actual values of PFAS. Scott Phillips is working with the study leads to create a science summary for the Chesapeake Bay portion of PA. A journal article will be forthcoming but is not published yet. Amy Williams was the lead for PA on this project. It is a very comprehensive study of PFAS sampling in PA.
    c. *STAC PFAS Proposal:* the proposal was accepted and will be moving forward. AS a reminder, the proposal focused on improving the understanding of PFAS in the Watershed. The final version is posted to the calendar page for today's meeting. This is focused on ecological effects and not drinking water.
    d. *Additional Announcements:*
        i. *Mark Richards:* There was a bill in 2021 session for VA of general assembly for PFAS and it would prevent the sale of packaging, carpet etc. that contained PFAS. The bill had a hearing but did not get out either chamber.
2. **Release and Demo of Mercury Story Map**
    a. **Action:** Hilary Swartwood will provide the Mercury Story Map link to the TCW after today's meeting.
    b. *Len Schugam:* what benchmark was used in this?
    c. *James Willacker:* we use the EPA human health benchmark; the paper provides details and information on these benchmarks. Also, a lot of this work is really the states and districts providing a lot of their raw monitoring data. The states really contributed significantly to this work.
    d. *Len Schugam:* does the story map allow you to download that data?
    e. *James Willacker:* it does not, some of the states were concerned about USGS hosting raw data. We provide data reports and data files for USGS data and refer to each state for specific data.
    f. *Len Schugam:* What was the reason why you couldn't look at temporal trends?
    g. *James Willacker:* we limited it to 2000 on, however we initially wanted to do a temporal analysis but the data across the watershed didn't allow that. There wasn't enough data overlap at the HUC and watershed level for us to have any confidence in the data.
    h. *Collin Eagle- Smith:* on data availability, the one thing you can download is the averages data.
    i. *Doug Austin:* I thought we had a presentation from Collin and if I remember correctly one of the takeaways was that a lot of methylation was going on there. Is that connected?

j. *Collin Eagle- Smith:* the discussion on methylation was a general overview of mercury but not Chesapeake Bay specific. To better understand those linkages more robust monitoring would need to happen to understand methyl mercury production. And what we've seen is that methyl mercury production varies across the watershed.

k. *James Willacker:* the linkage with this story map and the paper and data is an initial look that shows how mercury varies across the watershed. Without the monitoring it is hard to say why these patterns are occurring. It's certainly a possibility that sediment pollution could be a factor, but it's really a complicated process. Without a more detailed focus its' hard to do more than speculate.

l. *Scott Phillips:* those questions you provided are a good segue way into what next steps we want to be working on in the next 6- 9months. In March the PSC heard an overview of the monitoring networks and they put in a request of how these networks could be improved. We want to show how we can use an existing network.

m. *Greg Allen:* this is such wonderful work, and we did identify a lot of gaps and some of our follow- up is related to places where we don't have data and deciding if we need it and how to get it if we do. PCBs and mercury and methyl mercury tend to drive fish advisories, and these would be good for us to go after for policy and prevention activities. For mercury, we have taken the approach that we expect to see reductions as electric plants move away from coal. And we want to affirm that these reductions are taking place and if not, what actions need to be taken to reduce methyl mercury in fish.

3. PCBs in Schools Presentations

a. See calendar page for pdfs of today's presentations.

4. PCBs in Schools Discussion and Next Steps

a. *Greg Allen:* why is this a bio availability PCB issue? We know there are cases of not sufficient guidance and regulation and that raises the potential of them to become bio available. In terms of bio- availability there are probably bigger sources, but this could get to this point and we want to have healthy schools especially in disadvantages areas.

b. *Doug Austin:* if we are going to communicate this risk properly, who do we talk to? Some ideas: superintendents, facility managers etc. Maybe there are other ways to communicate like an infographic or other creative avenues.

c. *Shannon Sprague:* I think a good first step would be to put together something for Bay Backpack (site for educators and currently revising actions and projects page), which would engage students in the conversation. They can then advocate for the schools/ districts to take action. This is also bottom up. We also want to pursue the top- down solution with the district facility folks. Try to figure out where we are already meeting and presenting there would be an effective strategy.

d. *Len Schugam:* has any legislation actually been proposed for PCBs in FLBs?

e. *Greg Allen:* the political winds blew in favor of this at one point and it was thought that there might be some mandates around this, but it's been quiet for a while. I'm hearing from the group a lot of potential and at a minimum, doing more with guidance and education in a way that helps us understand if we can go further. If that means figuring out a way to find streams of money that can be applied to this in some way.

f. *Doug Austin:* is there any money set aside for things like this (Monsanto suits)?

g. *Len Schugam:* I don't have that information

h. *<u>Possible Paths Forward from Today's Meeting:</u>*

i. Risk communication

1. Education and outreach

a. To whom? – school superintendents, facility managers

b. How? – fact sheet, infographic, more "creative" avenues

c. PCBs alone or address through wholistic checklist? (Pb/Cu, asbestos)
d. Request reduction "pledges?"

2. Survey
   a. In conjunction with education and awareness?
   b. Ground-truth ERG report?

ii. Use upcoming land-use data (available late summer)
iii. Gold standard
   1. Actual PCB removals (with financial help)
   2. TMDL credit

i. Other Paths Forward:
   i. Bay Backpack (engage students in conversation; they can advocate for the schools/ districts – bottom-up approach)
   ii. Superintendent and Facility managers (bring guidance and listen for roadblocks and gaps, how to overcome- top-down approach)
   iii. Ex. of organization with sustainable plans: MAEOE (MD Association for Environmental and Outdoor Education); other states may have similar orgs.
   iv. Look at existing guidance/ help assess risk – does it need to be addressed now or later?
   v. Not all PCBs are created equal; some are more toxic than others. May need to look at what specific PCBs are used in light ballasts, which could help determine what needs to be addressed first.
   vi. Also look at caulk; which PCBs congeners are present etc. (much slower degredation than FLBs; army corps has guidance doc on this subject)
   vii. Are there existing pots of money already set aside for this?
   viii. Has any legislation been proposed for PCBs in FLBs?
   ix. PCB removal may be a "secondary" benefit for sustainability/LED initiative
   x. It would be important to assess the problem better as a health problem, new developments in passive sampling would allow PCB assessments of air quality in schools containing PCB ballast

5. **Wrap UP and Adjourn**

Call Participants

Mark Richards, VA DEQ
Len Schugam, MDE
Tom Parham, MDR
Paul Hlavinka, MDE
Hon Cargill, DNREC
George Onyullo, DOEE
Matt Kundrat, PA DEP
Greg Allen, EPA
Doug Austin, SEE EPA
Erin Sullivan, EPA Region 3

This meeting is recorded for internal use to ensure the accuracy of the meeting minutes.

Shannon Sprague, NOAA
Dave Whitall, NOAA
Emily Majcher, USGS
Scott Phillips, USGS
Trevor Needham, USGS
Kelly Smalling, USGS
Collin Eagle- Smith, USGS
James Willacker, USGS
Jessica Rodriguez, DoD
Marel King, CBC
Mark Hoffman, CBF
Olivia Wisner, CRC
Kelly Bunker, EPA Region 3