

*\*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 Minutes**

**Date:** Wednesday, June 9, 2021

**Time:** 1:00 - 3:00 PM

**Location:** Conference Call (remote only)

**Calendar Page:** [Link](#).



Agenda Item and Desired Outcome	Time	Background Docs, Notes, and <a href="#">Action Items</a>
<p><b>1. Introductions and Announcements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EPA is considering the <a href="#">Bear Creek area in Sparrows Point</a>, once owned by Bethlehem Steel Corporation, for addition to the National Pollution Priority List. This 60- acre section contains contaminants ranging from arsenic to PCBs.</li> <li><a href="#">EPA Fish and Shellfish Program Newsletter</a> for May 2021. If interested in receiving this newsletter please email <a href="mailto:fish_advisory@epa.gov">fish_advisory@epa.gov</a> with subject “subscribe.”</li> <li>On <i>June 15<sup>th</sup> from 12- 3 PM</i> Researchers from the EPA-funded Puget Sound Stormwater Interagency Agreement will report out to EPA on their work, which includes the coho pre-spawn mortality and toxicology research. If interested in attending, reach out to Hilary Swartwood (<a href="mailto:swartwood.hilary@epa.gov">swartwood.hilary@epa.gov</a>) for the calendar invite.</li> </ul>	1:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Complete the toxic contaminant indicator</a></li> <li><a href="#">Update the PCB Story Map</a></li> <li><a href="#">Send contaminants in ag watersheds story map link to TCW once published</a></li> <li><a href="#">TCW leadership will reach out to contact leads for EPA’s Executive Council on PFAS to share information / invite them to participate in STAC PFAS Workshop.</a></li> <li><a href="#">TCW will be added ton an upcoming AgWG agenda to present on TCs in Ag watersheds.</a></li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Overview of workplan to improve CBP monitoring networks: opportunities for the TCW –</b>            Scott Phillips, and Peter Tango, USGS</p> <p>Peter and Scott will provide an overview of the STAR workplan to address the Principal Staff Committee (PSC) request to improve CBP monitoring networks. The opportunities to improve monitoring to address TCW data needs for PCBs and mercury in the Logic and Action Plans will be discussed at upcoming TCW calls.</p>	1:10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Link</a> to STAR work plan for improving monitoring networks.</li> <li><a href="#">Link</a> to PSC Presentation</li> <li><a href="#">Slides</a> related to monitoring in TCW Logic and Action Plans</li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Discussion on next steps for mitigating contaminants in Ag Watersheds –</b> Greg Allen, EPA, and Scott Phillips, USGS</p> <p>Based on the presentations to the TCW on May 19, we will review ideas suggested on the Jamboard and discuss next steps to promote the co-benefits of toxic contaminant mitigation from nutrient and sediment BMPs. We will be joined by Loretta Collins (UMD/ AgWG</p>	1:50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Link to <a href="#">Jamboard Results</a></li> <li>Link to <a href="#">May Calendar Page</a></li> </ul>

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

Coordinator), Ruth Cassilly (UMD), Leon Tillman (NRCS Chesapeake Bay Coordinator), and Kelly Shenk (EPA).		
<b>4. Wrap Up and Adjourn</b>	2:55	• <b>Next meeting: Wednesday, July 14, 2021</b>

### Summary of Actions and Decisions

**Action:** The TCW will work on generating monitoring needs to share with Peter Tango and his team. If interested in participating in this work, please reach out to TCW leadership.

**Action:** TCW Leadership will use the feedback from the June and May meetings to generate a draft toxic contaminants in ag watersheds working plan that can be used to determine next steps.

### Meeting Minutes

#### 1. Intro and Announcements:

- a. Bear Creek: this is supposed to be proposed in August, followed by a public comment period. We might want to engage in something that showcases regional efforts to show these large- scale remedial activities that are addressing in-stream sediment (sediment that's at the bottom, specifically PCBs).
- b. Fish and Shellfish Newsletter: feel free to subscribe. The May 2021 newsletter focused on research around PFAS.
- c. Puget Sound Webinar: Invite was forwarded to TCW but reach out to Hilary Swartwood if it needs to be resent.

#### 2. Overview of workplan to improve CBP monitoring networks: opportunities for the TCW

- a. Discussion after Peter Tango's Presentation:
  - i. *Emily Majcher*: I am assuming we are working independently to provide enhancements to you. Will you be looking for cross group/ git needs? For example, if one of the groups suggest more toxic monitoring, but we may not be aware, will that be synthesized across groups?
  - ii. *Peter Tango*: after each group, I am placing any suggestions and placing them in my recommendations section of my report. As we get closer to the end, I am hoping we can look at it holistically, so we aren't duplicating.
  - iii. *Scott Phillips*: One of the places where we can see if there is overlap is during the STAC Workshop. We also have been sending out a newsletter that people can view on the STAR webpage.
  - iv. *Greg Allen*: What are the full range of things that need to be done to try to ensure we don't end up with additionally needs but no additional funds.
  - v. *Peter Tango*: looking at price tags for different items to see what we can do with our resources and if that funding isn't there what will we need to complete these things.
  - vi. *George Onyullo*: I think Peter has highlighted something important which is capacity shortfall. I don't know a good way to scour the Bay Program to find all the networks. We have a lot of competing interests so how do we come to a place where we have one network.
  - vii. *Scott Phillips*: I don't think we have one network; I think we have connected networks. Right now, we have base networks and now we are looking at what still needs to be done/ which ones can be enhanced.

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

viii. *Greg Allen:* I think for us it will come down to some hard prioritization of what toxic contaminants we can focus on, because we could give you a list of thousands.

b. Discussion after Scott Phillips Presentation:

- i. *Greg Allen:* I volunteer for the small team on toxics. We know when we get to the back end of this, and dollar needs start showing we might find that some of the needs are also in analysis needs. One recommendation could be more time for skilled analysts to look at this information.
- ii. *Breck Sullivan:* One thing to consider when you are coming up with your recommendations is to also submit them to the science needs database because if they can't be addressed through monitoring, they could get covered through the science needs work.
- iii. **Action:** The TCW will work on generating monitoring needs to share with Peter Tango and his team. If interested in participating in this work, please reach out to TCW leadership.

3. **Discussion on next steps for mitigating contaminants in Ag Watersheds**

a. Discussion:

- i. *Greg Allen:* we need to rank to most frequent BMPS in terms of the ones that will help us the most.
- ii. *Scott Phillips:* Getting Leon involved, are there practice in the BMP list that could be incentivized at NRCS.
- iii. *Leon Tillman:* Our fiscal year starts in October, and we plan out these a year in advance. It would be the cost of implementation as the main factor for what gets incentivized. It is not too often that payments are made where there is not a loss of production on that land use. Are others aware of states and their state technical advisory meetings?
- iv. *Scott Phillips:* I don't think our members are very much, but I think those are the connections we are trying to make to figure out
- v. *Loretta Collins:* Mark Dubin is our senior ag advisor, and he attends a lot of the technical advisory meetings, and he would have a good handle on who to talk to.
- vi. *Leon Tillman:* It may be a situation that some of the states are grouped in regional payment schedules. If the initiative is to adjust the payment rate, just be aware of that fact.
- vii. *Emily Majcher:* Are the costs that we are discussing does that overlap / influenced by priority BMPs vs. soil health BMPs? Is it independent of those?
- viii. *Leon Tillman:* the payment rates of NRCS are determined independently of those BMPs. Although it may be a priority practice the rate will be the same. The priority practice may just get more priority for funding and increase likelihood that a participant would be funded for those practices. To the sticky note, attending the technical advisory meetings, but if there are practice s that have a co-benefit or have the ability to address some of your concerns. States need that feedback so they can prioritize.
- ix. *Leon Tillman:* I see it going through RCPP and those rates are very similar to state EQUIPs (Regional Conservation Partnership Program). Through this program they can request specific funds for targeted conservation efforts. Through RCPP you can target specific practices, or areas for funding or technical assistance.
- x. **Action:** TCW Leadership will use the feedback from the June and May meetings to generate a draft toxic contaminants in ag watersheds working plan that can be used to determine next steps.

Call Participants

Emily Majcher, USGS

Vicki Blazer, USGS

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

Scott Phillips, USGS  
Leon Tillman, NRCS  
Dave Whitall, NOAA  
Greg Allen, EPA  
Doug Austin, SEE- EPA  
Breck Sullivan, CRC  
Tom Parham, MDNR  
Rob Reeding, VA DEQ  
Marel King, CBC  
Matt Kundrat, PA DEP  
Lori Baker, DNREC  
Ruth Cassilly, UMD  
George Onyullo, DOEE  
Peter Tango, USGS  
Loretta Collins, UMD  
Kelly Shenk, EPA