**Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement Management Strategies**

**Toxic Contaminants Goal and Outcomes**

**Policy and Prevention Outcome (PCBs) Draft**

1. **Executive Summar**y
2. **Goal, Outcome and Baseline**

Toxic Contaminants Goal: Ensure that the Bay and its rivers are free of effects of toxic contaminants on living resources and human health.

Policy and Prevention Outcome: Continually improve practices and controls that reduce and prevent the effects of toxic contaminants below levels that harm aquatic systems and humans. Build on existing programs to reduce the amount and effects of PCBs in the Bay and watershed. Use research findings to evaluate the implementation of additional policies, programs and practices for other contaminants that need to be further reduced or eliminated.

Policy and Prevention Baseline: Derived from information provided by jurisdiction agencies responsible for issuing fish consumption advisories and implementation of Clean Water Act (CWA) programs.

* Extensive fish consumption advisories and widespread contamination of fish
* Extensive impairments of both tidal and non-tidal waters due to polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs)
* Numerous existing PCB TMDLs across the Watershed as well as additional TMDLs under development

1. **Jurisdictions and Agencies Participating in the Strategy**

The Toxic Contaminants Workgroup (TCW) has succeeded in extensive outreach and engagement of a wide array of stakeholders. Bay Agreement signatories and stakeholders who have indicated their intention to participate in management strategy development have been identified on the workgroup membership list. The membership of the TCW includes members from the following groups:

* Maryland Department of the Environment
* Maryland Department of Natural Resources
* Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
* DC Department of the Environment
* Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
* Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control
* New York Department of Environmental Conservation
* West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection
* Chesapeake Bay Commission
* Federal Agencies: EPA, USGS, FWS, DHS, NOAA
* Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO)
* Private sector organizations
* Local government organizations
* Academic institutions
* CBP Water Quality Goal Implementation Team Workgroups

**3.a Local Engagement**

Whereas much of the focus on implementation of practices and controls to reduce the amounts and effects of PCBs will initially be targeted to federal and state regulatory programs, there will be many opportunities for local governments, watershed associations, nonprofits, and the private sector to engage in innovative and collaborative efforts. As described above, the TCW has engaged non-government organizations (NGOs) in the more urbanized areas of the Bay’s tidal waters. This was done to ensure that the organizations in those areas that are influential in local efforts to improve environmental condition (e.g., Blue Water Baltimore, Anacostia Watershed Society, Elizabeth River Project) are represented in the management strategy and also as one element of increasing the diversity of participating stakeholders because these organizations work actively in communities that tend to be socially diverse. In addition, the TCW has several members that are from local water authorities (e.g., Washington Council of Governments, Hampton Roads Sanitation District) who are relied upon to help ensure that a local government perspective is considered and included in the management strategy. It is the responsibility of all members of the TCW to continually promote a high level of engagement by local entities (i.e., government and non-government) in this management strategy. The strategy will be distributed on a regular basis for input from local entities.

1. **Factors Influencing Ability to Meet Goal**

* Broad geographic extent and distribution of PCBs
* Different state water quality standards and different goals/endpoints across regulatory controls that may not be sufficiently protective to meet the goal
* Political will to modify regulatory programs and/or create voluntary programs
* High cost of remedies: in-stream sediment remediation; waste water PCB source trackdown studies; electrical equipment replacements; stormwater controls; site remediation
* Need to shift paradigm to acknowledge that there are ongoing sources of PCBs (i.e., PCBs are not static “legacy” contaminants)
* Knowledge gaps on relative sizes of PCB sources

1. **Current Efforts and Gaps**

To summarize current efforts, the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team’s Toxic Contaminants Workgroup has chosen to organize information by PCB loading mechanisms. Within each mechanism, the sources of PCBs specific to that mechanism and current programs, gaps and potential additional actions are discussed. As other toxic contaminants are subsequently prioritized, the Policy and Prevention Outcome provides the management process by which other contaminants in the watershed will be addressed, even though sources, management options and goals may differ.

*General Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL)*

The CWA established the framework for regulations related to the discharge of PCBs into the nation’s waterways. States and jurisdictions share in the implementation of the CWA through adoption of water quality standards, determination of whether water bodies meet water quality standards, and establishment of plans to achieve standards in impaired water bodies.

All of the states in the Chesapeake Watershed have identified waterbodies as impaired for PCBs based mostly on fish consumption advisories. (Insert map of impairments, established TMDLs and TMDLs under development) To address these impairments under the authority of the CWA, significant work has been completed in the watershed through TMDL development. TMDLs have been developed by the state of Maryland (MD), the Commonwealth of Virginia (VA), the District of Columbia (DC) and the state of West Virginia (WV) to address PCB impairments in the Chesapeake Bay and watershed. While there are no PCB listings for Delaware (DE) within the Chesapeake Bay watershed, a TMDL has been developed for the Delaware Bay and an extensive implementation strategy is under way and is achieving reductions of PCBs from regulated sources of stormwater and wastewater. Pennsylvania (PA) has developed a TMDL for a portion of the Susquehanna within the watershed. New York (NY) has not at this time developed TMDLs to address their PCB listings.

The TMDL projects range in scope from small-segment TMDLs to large sub-watershed TMDLs. Most notably, multi-jurisdictional PCB TMDLs have been approved for the Tidal Potomac River. Agencies in MD and VA along with U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 3 staff were actively involved in the development of the Tidal Potomac River TMDL. Multi-jurisdictional TMDLs have encouraged collaboration among government entities, which leads to more effective TMDL development. As an example, substantial progress has been achieved towards reducing levels of PCBs in the Delaware Estuary. Under the lead of the Delaware River Commission (DRBC), implementation efforts by multiple jurisdictions have resulted in a significant reduction of PCB levels. The successes in the Delaware Estuary have and will continue to inform the proposed reduction approaches in this management strategy and should be helpful in implementation of existing TMDLs in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

VA is working on TMDLs in the Elizabeth River, the tidal James River and associated tributaries. MD is developing PCB TMDLs in watersheds such as the Severn River, Bird River, Bush River and the Gunpowder River. Also, MD and PA are planning to sample the sediments behind Conowingo Dam to better understand Susquehanna River sources and inform TMDL development. The District of Columbia is working on revising TMDLs for a number of toxic pollutants in order to incorporate daily loads. While much of DC’s streams are covered under the 2007 Potomac River PCB TMDL, more work is needed in the Rock Creek watershed. EPA is providing technical assistance on this project through a grant with the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin (ICPRB).

*Other Regulatory Efforts*

The EPA regulates the use, disposal, and clean-up of PCBs under the Toxic Substance Control Act (TSCA). The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Corrective Action (CA) program has authority to require investigation and cleanup of a host of hazardous constituent. PCBs are not defined as a hazardous waste under RCRA and are not, in general, a common constituent of concern at RCRA Corrective Action (CA) facilities.  In an instance where PCBs are the main concern at a RCRA CA site, however, the investigation and remediation are conducted under the TSCA program.

TSCA provided the authority to phase out the manufacture and importation of PCBs. Since 1979, the manufacturing of PCBs has been prohibited unless exempted for example, for research and development purposes. The use of PCBs in existing equipment was allowed to continue for the useful or normal life of the equipment as long as specific conditions were met. Products and equipment containing PCBs are regulated mostly on the basis of their PCB concentrations. Products and equipment containing 500 parts per million (ppm) PCBs or greater are the most strictly regulated; those containing between 50ppm and 499 ppm less so. Products or equipment containing less than 50ppm are not generally regulated.

The PCB program is managed under the EPA Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention (OCSPP), Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER), and Enforcement and Compliance Assistance (OECA). Each Office is responsible for implementing a different aspect of the PCB Program. See Table 1.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 1** | | | |
| **EPA Office** | **OCSPP** | **OSWER** | **OECA** |
| **Function** | Implement Regulatory programs related to ongoing uses of PCBs | PCB cleanup and permitting of storage and disposal facilities | Compliance monitoring and enforcement |

In EPA Region 3, the PCB regulations and enforcement are managed by the Land and Chemicals Division (LCD). As part of its annual commitments since 2002, LCD has conducted PCB inspections at facilities throughout the Chesapeake Bay Watershed.  These entities included commercial storage and disposal facilities; facilities that own in-use PCB transformers, and a number of naval ships. Five enforcement actions have been undertaken by LCD for violations of the TSCA PCB regulations.

**Stormwater**

**Overview** - Stormwater is a significant mechanism for the transport and loading of PCBs to the surface waters of the watershed. Stormwater transports both dissolved and particulate-attached PCBs. Stormwater in urbanized areas is more likely to be contaminated with PCBs than stormwater in suburban, agricultural, or forested land areas. Stormwater becomes contaminated with PCBs due to runoff from contaminated surfaces (soils, hardscapes) and through wet atmospheric deposition during storm events. Stormwater from developed land areas (i.e., urban land use) is regulated under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program for the following source categories: 1) Phase I/II County Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4), 2) Phase II Municipality MS4, 3) Phase II Federal & State Facilities, 4) Phase I State Highway Administration (SHA), 5) Industrial Stormwater, and 6) Construction Activity. Stormwater from undeveloped land areas (i.e., non-urban) is generally unregulated.

The predominant source of PCBs in NPDES regulated and unregulated stormwater is contaminated soils from historical and ongoing activities involving PCB containing equipment or materials. PCB contaminated soils may be present at contaminated sites regulated under Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA/Superfund), active industrial and commercial facilities, illegal dumpsites, and construction sites as well as sites owned by federal agencies. Active electrical equipment such as transformers may also contaminate soils due to failure and release of PCBs. Additional sources that may contribute PCBs in NPDES regulated and unregulated stormwater include building materials (e.g., caulking materials and paints) that may mobilize PCBs during demolition, atmospheric deposition, land application of biosolids as an alternative for chemical fertilizers, and land disposal of dredged materials from the maintenance of stormwater BMPs. PCB sources from regulated contaminated sites and atmospheric deposition will be addressed in separate sections of this document.

**Stormwater Sources, Current Management Efforts and Gaps**

*TMDL Development*

In the development of TMDLs, some watershed monitoring has been conducted using high resolution congener based methods (e.g., EPA Method 1668) to estimate loads for NPDES regulated and unregulated stormwater. For TMDLs in MD that have already been approved, no stormwater outfall monitoring was conducted in order to estimate loads for NPDES regulated stormwater. Aggregate loads for all NPDES regulated stormwater dischargers under the county level Phase I MS4 permits have been assigned in these TMDLs. VA is currently applying a land use-based approach for estimating PCB loads for NPDES regulated stormwater using outfall monitoring data. VA has also monitored and estimated loads for industrial stormwater facilities using EPA Method 1668 for PCB analysis.

*TMDL Implementation*

TMDL implementation for NPDES regulated and unregulated stormwater is required when reductions are assigned to these loading mechanisms in a TMDL. Currently no implementation plans have been developed by regulatory agencies within MD, VA, or DC to address reductions assigned to NPDES regulated or unregulated stormwater. In MD, Phase I MS4 permittees are required to develop a county-level implementation plan to address reductions assigned to NPDES regulated stormwater within one year of TMDL approval. MD has developed guidance to assist counties in the development of these plans. (Link <http://www.mde.state.md.us/programs/Water/TMDL/DataCenter/Documents/MDE%20Recommendations%20for%20Addressing%20PCBs%207_30_12_3.pdf>) Montgomery County MD has developed a plan that has been approved by MD to address reductions assigned in the Tidal Potomac and Anacostia PCB TMDLs. Baltimore County, Baltimore City, and Prince George’s County MD have also developed plans to address PCB reductions to NPDES regulated stormwater that are currently under review by MD. VA is also developing a Pollution Minimization Plan (PMP) guidance document, which will provide technical assistance to NPDES regulated wastewater and stormwater dischargers for achieving PCB load reductions assigned in TMDLs.

**Stormwater Gaps**

*Stormwater Monitoring Gaps*

There is currently limited PCB monitoring data for unregulated and NPDES- regulated stormwater from all jurisdictions within the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Jurisdictions which have already developed TMDLs to address PCB impairments have estimated loads for unregulated and NPDES-regulated stormwater using in-stream PCB monitoring data. VA has also conducted PCB monitoring of stormwater from NPDES industrial facilities. However, TMDL programs in general have limited resources to conduct outfall monitoring for NPDES regulated stormwater dischargers and thus apply a watershed scale approach to estimate these loads.

Except for very few industrial MS4 stormwater permittees, NPDES regulated stormwater dischargers in all Bay jurisdictions are not currently required to monitor for PCBs under any permit category. Without this information it is not feasible for TMDL programs to estimate loads from specific dischargers to identify sources of PCBs that require reductions as well as to track-down sources of PCB contamination within the watershed. High resolution/low detection limit data is needed as demonstrated in the Delaware Bay TMDL where such data was critical to target PCB reductions.

*Stormwater Regulatory Gaps*

Transformers that are currently in operation containing PCB concentrations less than 50 ppm are categorized as PCB-free and do not require removal. These transformers have the potential to release PCBs during failure and to contaminate stormwater at levels that may impact water quality.

NPDES regulated stormwater dischargers do not currently have effluent concentration limits for PCBs in their permits. All Bay jurisdictions have adopted human health criterion to prevent potential carcinogenic impacts from the consumption of fish. However, this criterion is currently only applicable to ambient waters.

*Stormwater Programmatic Gaps*

PMPs are required to address PCB load reductions from unregulated and NPDES regulated stormwater that have been allocated through TMDL development. Currently no jurisdiction within the Bay has begun implementing TMDLs to reduce these loads. A PMP framework should include an approach for identifying sources of contamination within the watershed which contribute PCBs to unregulated and NPDES regulated stormwater and provide guidance on best management practices (BMPs) and treatment technology for controlling or reducing sources of PCBs.

Stormwater BMPs designed to reduce nutrients and sediments may also provide a secondary benefit of removing PCBs, which preferentially bind to the organic carbon fraction of sediments. There is insufficient knowledge regarding the effectiveness of PCB removal from these BMPs.

The public is generally unaware of the potential health impacts of consuming fish with elevated levels of PCBs and continued presence of PCBs in many sources (e.g., transformers, building materials, paints) within the environment that may contribute to unregulated and NPDES-regulated stormwater.

*Stormwater Research Gaps*

Biosolids which may contain PCBs are often land applied in agricultural and commercial practices as an alternative to chemical fertilizers. Limited information is available on whether land application of biosolids containing PCBs are a source of PCBs in unregulated and NPDES regulated stormwater.

Stormwater BMPs are routinely dredged to maintain capacity and effectiveness in the removal of sediments. Dredged materials may contain PCBs associated with these sediments and are often land applied for disposal as they are not categorized as hazardous materials. Limited information is available on whether land application of dredged materials is a source of PCBs in unregulated and NPDES regulated stormwater.

Construction activities associated with the demolition/remodeling of buildings with PCB containing materials and disturbance of soil contaminated with PCBs due to historical activities has the potential to release PCBs into the environment. Limited information is available on whether construction activities are a source of PCBs in unregulated and NPDES regulated stormwater.

As further discussed below, there is a need for advancing understanding of the atmospheric sources of PCBs to the landscape during dry and wet atmospheric deposition.

**Wastewater**

**Overview** - Surface water contamination from PCBs may occur through both industrial and municipal wastewater discharges; however, the presence of PCBs in effluent is highly dependent on the particular site or facility. If elevated concentration of PCBs are a concern for an industry, wastewater contamination can occur through exposure of process waters to residual PCBs from historical spills, through the inadvertent production of PCBs from the process itself or from intermediary materials used in the process, or from the recycling of products that contain residual inadvertently produced PCBs. Exposure of stormwater to historic spills on industrial sites may also be a loading source to wastewater. Similarly, if elevated concentrations of PCBs are a concern for a municipal discharger, potential PCB sources can include light industrial waste water, contaminated sites contributing to combined sewer overflows (CSO), inflow & infiltration from contaminated sites, or residual contamination in the municipal pipe infrastructure from historic spills. PCBs may also enter municipal systems via surface water used for potable water. Due to the highly varied nature of the sources to municipal facilities, identifying the potential source or sources presents a unique challenge as compared to industrial dischargers.

**Wastewater Sources, Current Management Efforts and Gaps**

*Industrial and Municipal Wastewater*

TMDLs are the primary mechanism for addressing PCB impairments for the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. Until recently, it was not apparent that wastewater could serve as a PCB conduit to the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Dating back to the early 1980’s and extending to more a recent time, this extremely hydrophobic contaminant was not detected in wastewaters using 40 CFR promulgated analytical methods. With the availability of improved analytical tools to screen wastewater at environmentally relevant concentrations (low part per quadrillion), determining whether PCBs are present can now be made in any matrix, including wastewater. Low level (part per quadrillion) water quality criteria intended to protect fish from bioaccumulating PCBs at concentrations considered unsafe for human consumption have been promulgated by each Bay jurisdiction.

Once PCB fish consumption advisories have been created for a water body, there is a requirement for a TMDL study or similar approach to restore the impairment. A critical component to the TMDL study is identification and delineation of all prospective PCB sources. In the majority of PCB impaired water bodies, the potential for wastewater as a source requires examination.

With emphasis on the wastewater loading mechanism for purposes of this discussion, Table 2 provides a summary of jurisdictional activities used to address PCBs. There are moderate differences among the jurisdictions on the types of facilities selected to monitor for PCBs in wastewater. DE, MD, VA, and D.C. approach the screening of municipal and industrial facilities in a similar manner although there are variants in the types of facilities that are assessed. For example, VA adheres to guidelines predicated on the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) used in the NPDES Permitting Program, for identifying and selecting a broader array of industrial facilities known to be potential PCB sources. The numbers and type of samples collected and analyzed at a facility may vary depending on the jurisdiction. In all cases when a jurisdiction is developing a PCB TMDL and monitoring occurs for that purpose, a low detection, high resolution method is used that is also capable of detecting 209 PCB congeners.

Upon generating the low level PCB data, total PCB concentrations are converted to a mass loading and then compared to the TMDL-derived Waste Load Allocation (WLA). If there is an exceedance of the WLA, the reduction is often addressed as a non-numeric Water Quality Based Effluent Limit (WQBEL) administered through each jurisdiction’s respective NPDES Program as a PMP.

Table 2. Comparison of Chesapeake Bay jurisdictions wastewater PCB screening methods

and approaches used to attain reductions



*TMDL Implementation and Wastewater*

In situations where an industrial or municipal facility has an effluent loading in excess of the assigned WLA, a PMP may be utilized to reduce PCB loadings through adaptive implementation in order to meet the WLA. PMPs are intended to be flexible tools that allow dischargers to identify and respond to potential sources in the most effective manner possible. Numerous examples of PMPs from outside the watershed exist along with guidance that can be used in the development of PMPs

The basic elements of the PMPs may include a better characterization of PCB loadings into the system under varying conditions as needed in order to provide the permittee with additional information that may aid in source identification; proposed actions for known or potential sources; proposed actions to find and control unknown sources; and an identification of the methods used to measure, demonstrate and report progress. The sensitivity of the analytical method(s) used for PCB identification in monitoring or track-down studies must be aligned with the detection and quantification objectives of the study.

TMDL loads were assigned to point sources and permitting authorities struggled with the permitting process. Loads were often very small with no practical treatment available. Many times, depending on the point source location in the watershed, PCBs already existing in the environment pass through a facility’s treatment trains. Many of these facilities were not sure whether they were adding or removing PCBs. Sampling wet weather and dry weather flows with sensitive methods is used to determine the actual input of point sources, and, if it was concluded that they had input, they are required to implement a PMP.

*Wastewater Efforts – Combined Sewer Systems*

In a combined sewer systems (CSS), both stormwater and sanitary sewage are conveyed to a wastewater treatment facility. If a wet weather event generates a stormwater volume that exceeds the capacity of the collection system and/or treatment facility, a portion of the combined waste stream is diverted to combined sewer outfalls resulting in a combined sewer overflow (CSO). Depending on the system, the combined release of stormwater and untreated wastewater may be a conveyance mechanism for PCBs to local waterways. CSS communities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed are implementing measures to reduce the frequency of CSOs which could have a concurrent benefit of reducing the loadings of PCBs to surface waters. Several of these communities are pursuing an integrated planning approach that allows the community to prioritize the wastewater and stormwater management activities for the greatest water quality benefit.

**Wastewater Gaps**

*Tools to Support Trackdown Studies*

The current high resolution analytical method for PCBs is expensive relative to the costs of most other organic contaminant monitoring and may be cost-prohibitive for large-scale trackdown studies. An inexpensive tool that can provide real-time data can greatly improve the efficacy of a trackdown study in municipal service areas. Information regarding lessons learned in other PCB trackdown studies would be useful in guiding municipalities in their own local efforts.

*Disconnect between CERCLA, RCRA, TSCA and CWA targets*

Three issues relating to PCB investigations and remediation could benefit from EPA guidance. First, there are inconsistencies across programs in the methods used to analyze PCBs in environmental media. Second, the remediation levels that have historically been used to clean up soil and sediment are not low enough to prevent bioaccumulation into tissues of fish and other organisms consumed by humans. Third, lack of coordination among programs may lead to inconsistencies in approaches to PCB investigation and remediation.

*Inadvertent Production of PCB*s

While PCBs have been banned since the late 1970’s, the Toxics Substances Control Act (TSCA) continues to allow the inadvertent manufacture of PCBs. The allowed concentration is up to a maximum of 50 parts per million (ppm) provided an annual average of 25 ppm is met by the manufacturer. As PCB data are made available from wastewater monitoring using a sensitive method, it is becoming more evident that PCBs inadvertently produced are ending up in the environment. Prime examples include PCB congeners 11, 206, 207, 208 and 209.

**Groundwater**

**Overview** – Groundwater can be a transport mechanism for PCBs particularly when it underlies highly contaminated surface soils. Contaminated groundwater that is near edge of stream is more likely to contribute to bio-availability of PCBs than upland groundwater.

**Groundwater Sources, Current Management Efforts and Gaps**

Underground Injection Control - The Underground Injection Control (UIC) program under the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) will continue to conduct inspections of close endangering shallow injection wells. If any PCBs are identified at inspected facilities, any groundwater discharge is eliminated.

Drinking Water - Data is collected and managed on public water supplies located in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Data on exceedances of Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) or drinking water standards is available. The MCL for PCB is 0.0005 milligram per liter (mg/L). Monitoring frequency for PCBs is dependent on the size of the public water supply. Monitoring is conducted post-treatment. Data on detections of unregulated contaminants under the Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Rule (UCMR) cycle 1, 2 and 3 from public water supplies are available. These unregulated contaminants may be a health concern and EPA assesses their occurrence in order to decide if they should be regulated in the future. Cycle 1 and 2 were completed earlier and cycle 3 just began in January 2013 and monitoring is still ongoing. Determining the contaminants for Cycle 4 will begin in 2015 and data collection is estimated to begin in 2017.

**Groundwater Gaps**

A gap may exist in the availability of high resolution-low detection data on groundwater PCB concentrations.

**Atmospheric**

**Overview** – Atmospheric deposition of PCBs occurs both as indirect loading to the land surface which is transported to surface waters mostly through stormwater and as loading that is directly deposited on surface water. Loadings occur as wet deposition (i.e., during rain events) and as dry deposition. Once in the system, PCBs volatilize to the atmosphere and are redeposited as part of the ongoing flux and transportation of PCBs. Little is known about the amount of atmospheric PCBs that originate inside as opposed to outside the watershed but it is expected that many sources within the watershed comprise the majority of the atmospheric inputs. Atmospheric PCBs deposited to land are problematic to water management programs such as in stormwater and combined stormwater and wastewater systems.

**Atmospheric Sources, Current Management Efforts and Gaps**

There are several sources of PCBs in the atmosphere. Such sources include 1) thermal and other industrial processes (i.e., industrial emitters); 2) emission from water bodies containing PCBs; 3) materials containing PCBs (i.e., transformers); 4) use of products containing PCBs (i.e., heating oil). Of the above sources, some are more likely to be current contributors to atmospheric loads of PCB. Thermal processes of any type can contribute to production of PCBs in the atmosphere if chlorine and organic carbon are present in the combustion feed. Likewise the burning of heating oils may contribute to airborne PCBs if PCBs are present in the heating oil and are combusted. Additionally, there are PCBs emitted due to incomplete combustion of PCB impurities in heating oil, or if PCBs volatilize from the contaminated oil product when transferred for use or otherwise spilled/mishandled. Current RCRA regulations allow for the reuse of oils that contain less than 2 parts per million PCBs for a variety of applications including as fuel oil.

The production of PCBs as a product on their own has been banned for decades so this is most likely not a prominent source of PCB contamination to the atmosphere. Also, due to the hydrophobicity of most congeners of PCB, emission from water bodies is also likely a minor source of atmospheric load.

The largest contributor to atmospheric load of PCBs is potentially dielectric fluids that are spilled or otherwise released from transformers and capacitors that utilized the fluids for proper operation. When heated due to electrical load, transformers develop positive internal pressure, which can result in release of PCB-containing vapors.

In the year 1970, dielectric fluids accounted for 56 percent of the PCBs manufactured in the US. Plasticizers and hydraulic fluids and lubricants were the next largest categories at 30 and 12 percent respectively. The National Response Center (maintained by EPA) is notified of releases of PCBs that exceed reportable quantities. To emphasize the point that PCBs are not simply related to past releases (i.e., legacy contamination), data indicates that from 1990 through 2002, over 1000 PCB releases were reported in the Great Lakes states. These reported releases typically involved accidents or illicit activities involving transformers or capacitors, such as a capacitor leaking due to an electrical failure, vandalism of transformers, transformer fires, and illegal dumping.

PCBs are listed as a group as one of 188 hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) under section 112(b) of the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments. Incineration of PCBs is regulated under 60 CFR 761. However, there are currently no PCB incinerators in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. The EPA also established National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) under the CAA to protect the public and lists PCBs as one of 33 Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs) presenting the greatest threat to public health in urban areas.

**Atmospheric Gaps**

Atmospheric Monitoring Gaps

* Consistency among air/water/waste programs using low level PCB analyses (methods 608 & 8082) vs TMDLs using EPA Method 1668
* Monitoring of fuel oil burning facilities in order to determine the extent of PCB releases

Atmospheric Research Gaps

Integration of Method 1668 in areas where trace concentrations are expected; EPA methods 608 and 8082 could still be used, but in limited areas where PCB concentrations are expected to be high

Gaps

the. There are no current comprehensive atmospheric deposition source studies for the watershed. Available studies are from late 1990's.

**In-Stream Sediment**

**Overview** – In many areas of the watershed, PCB-contaminated sediments have accumulated on the bottom of streams, rivers, embayments and the Bay. The contamination comes from many sources and its presence is explained by the high affinity for PCBs to bind with sediment and to be transported by surface waters. These sources and transport mechanisms lead to the accumulation of contaminated sediments within bodies of surface water.

**In-stream Sediment Sources, Current Management Efforts and Gaps**

Defining the source of anthropogenic contamination into waterway sediments can be a difficult task. This is particularly true in settings where multiple point sources are present along with persistent non-point sources. This situation often results in complex mixtures of contaminants in sediments.

Remediation of PCB-contaminated sediments may affect local and downstream water quality during activities such as dredging and dewatering. The Clean Water Act establishes requirements and discharge limits for actions that affect surface water quality. Accordingly, the technical requirements of permits, such as the NPDES permit, may have to be met.

Within the Chesapeake Bay watershed, several current monitoring, restoration, and regulatory programs will reduce PCB loads from both point and non-point sources. These programs involve storm water runoff controls, erosion control measures to reduce sediments and nutrients, identification of additional PCB sources and contaminated sites, non-numeric water quality based effluent limits, construction site inspections, and remediation of contaminated sites. Follow up monitoring of sediments is an important feature of each jurisdiction’s implementation strategy.

The District of Columbia provides examples of ongoing cleanup activities occurring within the Bay region. For these, DC has several well-established programs to draw upon for their PCB TMDLs, including the Erosion and Sedimentation Control Amendment Act of 1994 and DC Law 5-188 (Storm Water Management Regulations – 1988) of The District of Columbia Water Pollution Control Act of 1984, and the Federal Nonpoint Source Management Program (Section 319 of the Clean Water Act).

The District of Columbia, under authority of various laws, implements a number of action plans that involve reviewing and approving construction plans for stormwater runoff control measures, erosion and sediment control measures, and landscaping; conducting routine and programmed inspections at construction sites; providing technical assistance to developers and DC residents; and conducting investigations of citizen complaints related to drainage and erosion and sediment control. In conjunction with regulatory activities, voluntary programs are implemented through the Non-point Source Management and Chesapeake Bay Implementation programs. It is expected that through implementation of sediment and nutrient control measures, PCB-contaminated sediment will also be removed.

Region 3 is currently overseeing a PCB clean up at the Lockheed Martin plant located in Middle River, Maryland.  The Middle River facility is located on Cowpen Creek which contains contaminated sediments considered to be a major contributor to PCBs in the Bay.  Lockheed Martin owns the site, where it assembles military launch electronic systems.  The clean-up is being done under TSCA authority and will be broken up into 3 phases (graphics box?):

1. Expedited sediment removal action (2014): dredging 1.2 acres containing sediments with the greatest amount of PCB contamination (3600 ppm) is underway;
2. Full sediment remedy (2016-2018):  additional removal of 13.8 acres will begin in 2016-2017, and activated carbon in-situ treatment over 10.2 acres (remedial goal of 0.676 ppm expected to be reached after 7 years of in-situ treatment); and
3. Full soil remedy.

**In-stream sediment gaps**

TBD

**Contaminated Sites**

**Overview**

Contaminated sites are a potential source of PCBs in loading mechanisms for stormwater, groundwater and atmospheric deposition. PCBs may enter stormwater from the erosion and transport of contaminated soils in surface runoff. Secondly, PCBs may enter groundwater from the infiltration of rainfall through contaminated soils. Finally, PCBs may enter the atmosphere through volatilization from contaminated soils. CERCLA, otherwise known as the Superfund Program, governs the clean-up of hazardous substances at contaminated sites. In addition, clean-up of contaminated sites for redevelopment may also occur under the Brownfields and VCP programs. Site remediation requires that PCB soil concentrations meet soil cleanup standards protective of human health through soil ingestion, inhalation and dermal contact.

**Current Management Efforts for to Control or Reduce PCB Loads from Contaminated Sites**

State Efforts

*TMDL Development*

MD, VA, and DC have estimated loads and assigned allocations for contaminated sites in the development of PCB TMDLs. These jurisdictions have estimated loads using soil concentration data acquired from environmental site assessment studies conducted by each State’s Land Management Programs. The soil concentration data from these studies are generally measured using aroclor based methods (e.g., EPA Methods 608 and 8082).

*TMDL Implementation*

TMDL implementation for contaminated sites is required when reductions are assigned to these loadings in a TMDL. MD and DC currently have not assigned reductions within a PCB TMDL. VA has identified contaminated sites that require reductions in order to achieve a TMDL, however an implementation plan has not been developed to address these reductions. (Check with VA on details).

*Contaminated Site Assessment & Remediation*

State Land Management Programs are responsible for conducting Environmental Site Assessments and Ecological/Human Health Risk Assessments to identify toxic contaminants which require remediation. Clean-up of these sites are facilitated through the Federal Superfund Program.

EPA Efforts

CERCLA/Superfund

Contaminated sites regulated under Superfund require remediation of environmental media contaminated with PCBs to levels that do not impact aquatic life and human health. Within its Chesapeake Bay initiative, the EPA Region 3 Hazardous Site Cleanup Division (HSCD) Site Assessment program is working with the states and other federal agencies to review the existing CERCLIS inventory to create a current status or “baseline” of the three high-urban areas of the Chesapeake Bay that were identified in the past: the Baltimore Harbor, Anacostia and Elizabeth River areas. Sites identified in this review have been or are being investigated for potential cleanup through the CERCLA site assessment process. EPA Region 3 HSCD is working closely with the Maryland Department of the Environment, Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, District of Columbia, and the US Army Corps of Engineers to ensure that these priority areas are assessed under a comprehensive systematic approach.

The purpose of this project was to accomplish identifying and investigating possible land sources of toxic substances including PCBs, which are contributing to contaminated sediments in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. If land sources are identified, these sources may be listed on the National Priorities List (NPL) for potential remedial actions. Also, if other cleanup mechanisms are available, such as state voluntary cleanup programs, the sites may be deferred to the respective jurisdictions. Cleanup of these sources will ultimately assist in developing a comprehensive strategy restoring the three priority watershed areas.

In accordance with the Region III Chesapeake Bay goals, a baseline of 65 sites had been identified in the three priority high-urban areas. Since this initiative began in FY2010, the site assessment program has completed assessments at 120 sites, far exceeding even combined Regional goals. During this time through typical site assessment work and activities, additional sites have been identified within the priority areas, investigated, and added to the baseline. Accomplishments for FY2010 through FY2014 are shown in the following chart:
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District Department of the Environment (DDOE), the EPA, and the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE), have been focusing on potential land sources of PCBs that have been found in the sediments of the Anacostia River. EPA has been working with DDOE to address three sites along the Anacostia that are known PCB sources. DDOE has entered into a consent decree with Washington Gas Light and Pepco Benning Road to evaluate and remediate sources of contamination onsite. Also, DDOE is in the process of doing an investigation at Kenilworth Landfill to determine whether remediation is necessary.

The DDOE has also been concerned about potential up-gradient sources of PCBs in the Anacostia and its tributaries coming from Maryland. Under a CERCLA pre-remedial cooperative agreement with EPA, MDE has evaluated five sites in the Anacostia watershed that area adjacent to the Anacostia and/or its tributaries and were known to have used PCBs in the past. Results of these investigations did not show any clear evidence of ongoing PCB contamination into the Anacostia or its tributaries from these five sites.

The HSCD Site Assessment Program continues to evaluate sites within the Chesapeake Bay Watershed as part of everyday responsibilities to evaluate sites for the NPL. While the focus has not exclusively been on PCBs, most of the sites are evaluated for the full range of pollutants, which includes PCBs.

While the HSCD Brownfields program has had a tremendous amount of success over the years assessing and cleaning up sites in the Bay watershed, it is difficult to quantify specific types of contaminants being identified or cleaned up on sites.  The program collects general information in the ACRES database (e.g., VOCs, PAHS, metals, petroleum) but the database does not have details on the site constituents or levels of contamination.  As with Site Assessment, Brownfields does not have any special focus on PCBs, but they are addressed in the program. The jurisdictions also conduct brownfields assessments using funds that EPA provides to them to support their voluntary cleanup programs.

Examples of Brownfields include:

* Industrial/commercial facilities with PCB soil contamination due to historical use or from materials/equipment containing PCBs stored on-site (facility may have a general industrial stormwater permit or be unregulated).
* Illegal dumpsites with materials/equipment containing PCBs.
* Construction sites with PCB soil contamination due to historical use or from existing materials containing PCBs. Demolition or remodeling of buildings during construction may also be a source of PCBs to stormwater.

RCRA Corrective Action (CA)

Since FY 2010, EPA Region 3 has focused on reducing toxics in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed with increased emphasis in the three regional priority areas: the Baltimore Harbor, the Anacostia River and the Elizabeth River.  In the FY 2010 to 2014 time period, the EPA Region 3 RCRA CA program expedited cleanups for the 213 facilities within the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. EPA Region 3 hopes to meet or exceed the three RCRA National Program goals within this sensitive ecosystem.  These goals are: to control human exposure to hazardous constituents at RCRA facilities; to delineate and control groundwater releases at RCRA facilities; and, to complete remedy construction at RCRA facilities that permanently eliminates releases to the environment.

PCBs are not a common constituent of concern at RCRA CA facilities.  In an instance where PCBs are the main concern at a RCRA CA site, however, the investigation and remediation are conducted under the TSCA program. As of September 30, 2014, EPA Region 3 has made significant progress in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed.  It has been determined that human health exposures are under control at 181 facilities (85%); groundwater migration is under control at 170 facilities (80%) and that permanent remedies have been constructed at 123 facilities.  This level of success exceeds the average performance of the RCRA corrective program outside the watershed in EPA Region 3, and reflects our commitment to OECA to place higher priority on facilities located in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed.

EPA Region 3 is committed to continue its oversight of the proper use, storage, handling, and disposal of PCBs to prevent environmental contamination and human health exposure. EPA Region 3 will continue to oversee and expedite clean-up activities at all PCB Remediation sites and facilities, and RCRA CA facilities in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed, as well as throughout the Region.

Voluntary Cleanup Programs

During fiscal years 2009 and 2010, EPA Region 3 initiated a “PCB Challenge” to 32 companies identified as owning in-use PCB transformers. The challenge aspect was to encourage the owners of PCB transformers to develop and implement a management plan and timeline to remove and properly dispose of them. Through this initiative, the region was able to identify facilities that had already removed their transformers from service and disposed of them, as well as which facilities still maintained in-use PCB transformers. Several companies that did not register their PCB transformers with the National PCB Transformer Database by the due date of Dec 28, 1998 were the subject of subsequent enforcement actions.

As a result of the PCB Challenge, two facilities in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed (Dumfries, VA and Salisbury, MD) agreed to voluntarily remove and dispose of their PCB Transformers. Five of the six PCB transformers owned by these companies have been removed and properly disposed. The sixth is slated for removal in 2015.

Since 2002, there have been 18 PCB cleanups in the Chesapeake Bay watershed that were addressed under TSCA and the self-implementing PCB cleanup regulations. These 18 cleanups have resulted in the cumulative remediation of more than 5 acres of property, and the disposal of more than 2.9 million kg of PCB contaminated media (soil, concrete, building materials, etc.).

EPA Region 3 is responsible for reviewing, commenting and approving or disapproving all submitted self-implementing PCB cleanup plans. Implementation of a cleanup plan is not allowed by the regulations until approval is granted by EPA. EPA Region 3 issues a written decision on each notification/certification for self-implementing PCB cleanup under the Self-implementing PCB cleanup regulations at 761.61(a), which has specific cleanup levels and remedies. Alternatively, an entity may choose to conduct the cleanup under the Risk-based cleanup regulations at 761.61(c), which allow for some deviation from the specific cleanup levels and remedial alternatives, based upon the risk posed by the site. After approval and final cleanup of the site, EPA Region 3 receives a final disposal report and other documentation as necessary to ensure all clean up and disposal requirements were met.

Contaminated sites are regulated to ensure protection of human health through direct exposure but may not satisfactorily consider potential impacts through fish consumption. Responsible parties for contaminated sites are not required to determine whether stormwater PCB concentrations are in violation of human health water quality criteria. Ecological Risk Assessments may not account for the bioaccumulation of PCBs to protect aquatic biota (including fish) to meet the consumption use.

**Gaps in Current Management Efforts to Reduce PCB Loads from Contaminated Sites**

Monitoring gaps for Characterizing PCB Loads from Contaminated Sites

There is currently limited PCB monitoring data from Bay jurisdictions for regulated contaminated sites using high resolution congener based methods such as EPA Method 1668. Only VA has conducted monitoring at contaminated sites using this method. It is infeasible for TMDL programs to monitor contaminated sites using EPA Method 1668 due to limited resources. Regulated contaminated sites are only required to use Aroclor based methods (e.g., EPA Methods 608 and 8082) to assess PCB concentrations in environmental media (i.e. soil, water, and sediment). This method is sufficient to assess violations of soil clean-up standards. However, detection levels for this method are insufficient to accurately estimate loads from contaminated sites for TMDL development.

**5.a** **Actions, tools or technical support needed to empower local government and others.**

There is a need for communications tools that will emphasize the connection between PCBs and human health especially with regard to risks from the consumption of contaminated fish. It is expected that such information will motivate local and state-level governments to continue to apply public resources to mitigate and reduce PCBs with the additional benefit of raising awareness of safe levels of fish consumption for anglers in the watershed.

The management strategy will need to develop several opportunities and initiatives to help raise the capacity of local communities to address PCBs and other toxics contamination within their respective waterways. To this end, the policy and prevention component of the toxics management strategy will focus on two core areas of concern for local engagement: public awareness and technical capacity.

1. **Management Approach**

The TCW’s objective is to develop a management approach that adds value to the ongoing work of jurisdiction, federal, and local entities with respect to PCB controls and reductions. In keeping with the Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership’s (the Partnership) mission, the TCW will look for opportunities to accelerate, enable and continually improve the management actions described above, finding synergies and opportunities to share information across the partnership about what approaches are most cost effective (including based on information from other watershed programs).

The management approach described below identifies near term actions that are directly focused on management actions to reduce PCBs as well as the continuation of data synthesis and analysis to enhance future decisions on how the Partnership can enhance existing efforts. A key objective in the management approach is to seek out innovation and develop new commitments and stakeholder partnerships that will work to reduce PCBs within regulatory programs and across voluntary programs.

The approach will follow analysis of the relative size of the PCB load across the different loading mechanisms and sources followed by assessment of where there are opportunities to enhance existing programs for those sources and to create new programs. The management approach will be highly influenced by what we learn from other watersheds (e.g., Delaware Bay and the Great Lakes) as far as identifying management actions with the lowest cost and highest benefit.

*General TMDL Approaches*

* If opportunities exist for any multi-jurisdictional PCB TMDLs, provide organizational and technical assistance.
* Coordinate with the states in conducting consistent implementation measures throughout the Bay watershed.
* Provide technical support to understand whether PCB impairments could be addressed through a TMDL alternative. TMDL alternatives are a new approach that have been given to the states through the long-term version for the 303(d) program and which allows for addressing an impairment without necessarily developing a TMDL. This approach may be valuable in waterbodies where there are not very many permitted sources.
* Encourage use of method 1668 to analyze PCBs as it is the most sensitive method. This would ensure that PCBs are being characterized accurately.
* Encourage thoughtful consideration of TMDL endpoint. In particular, determine whether there is inconsistency in how the ambient water quality standard or the fish consumption values are used.

*Stormwater Regulatory Approaches*

Assess the feasibility of establishing a permit requirement for NPDES regulated stormwater dischargers, or a targeted subset of permittees, to monitor outfalls and apply high resolution congener based PCB analytical methods such as EPA Method 1668 either as a general requirement or as the result of targeted requirements. This requirement would also include industrial stormwater permittees with SIC classifications that indicate the facility has the potential for PCB contamination on site from historical use or current operation or disposal of PCB containing materials.

*Stormwater Programmatic Approaches*

Develop inventory of existing PCB outfall monitoring data for NPDES regulated stormwater dischargers and compile all available information from governmental and academic organizations. This inventory will demonstrate the widespread extent of PCB contamination in stormwater and the need for a monitoring requirement to support TMDL development and implementation.

Develop PMP guidance document for the control and reduction of PCBs in unregulated and NPDES regulated stormwater including an inventory of BMP options. This document would provide guidance to all Bay jurisdictions in implementing PCB load reductions established for dischargers through TMDL development while recognizing the need for flexibility in PMP design.

Coordinate educational workshops to provide public and regulated stormwater facilities owners with knowledge regarding human health impacts from PCBs, existing sources of PCBs in the environment, and actions that can be taken to eliminate these sources preventing the contribution of PCBs within unregulated and NPDES regulated stormwater.

Coordinate a voluntary action program to remove all transformers containing PCBs including those classified as PCB free (less than 50 ppm) from operation and remediate PCB contamination on-site from historical releases of these transformers. This program could also be expanded to include additional PCB containing equipment (e.g., fluorescent light ballasts).

Explore the feasibility of elimination of the “PCB free rule” so as not to exclude electrical equipment with less than 50 ppm PCBs.

*Stormwater Research Approaches*

Conduct research initiative to investigate whether construction activities associated with the demolition/remodeling of buildings PCB containing materials and disturbance of contaminated soils is a source of PCBs in unregulated and NPDES regulated stormwater.

Conduct research initiative to investigate whether land application of biosolids in commercial and agricultural practices is a source of PCBs in unregulated and NPDES regulated stormwater.

Conduct research initiative to investigate whether land application of dredged material from the maintenance of stormwater BMPs is a source of PCBs in unregulated and NPDES regulated stormwater.

Conduct research initiative to investigate the PCB removal effectiveness of stormwater BMPs that are designed to remove sediments and nutrients. Use the findings to enhance BMP scenario tools to allow analysis of multiple pollutant reduction benefits.

*Wastewater Approaches*

Support research on cost-effective tools for track-down studies and provide a mechanism for municipalities to share information on lessons learned from PMP development and implementation strategies. A trackdown workshop in addition to a dynamic database that is voluntarily updated by participating municipalities as new information becomes available would be useful.

Encourage EPA to provide guidance on integration of the various programs addressing toxics to reduce inconsistencies in analytical methods, target thresholds, and investigation and remediation approaches.

Explore opportunities to reduce the inadvertent manufacture of PCBs through the implementation of Pollution Prevention measures at applicable manufacturers. Review Environmental Council of States resolution on PCBs for additional opportunities to reduce the inadvertent manufacture of PCBs.

The EPA R3 NPDES Permits Branch will continue to address PCBs through the CWA framework.  Where waters have been identified as impaired and a TMDL has been established creating WLA for point sources, the NPDES Permitting program will ensure that permits are consistent with the TMDL.  The NPDES Permitting Program will draft and review permits with a focus on ensuring that PCB WLAs are clear and enforceable.  The NPDES Enforcement Program, through state oversight and its independent compliance monitoring and enforcement authorities, will ensure that these compliance limits are met.  If a permittee is in non-compliance with its compliance obligations, EPA will take timely and appropriate action, including exercising its enforcement authority, to ensure that the permittee returns to compliance in an expeditious manner.

*Groundwater Approaches*

Identify opportunities for improved communication between the SDWA delegated authorities and the public water supply utilities and any entity that has located an upstream source of PCBs or is conducting any type of activity (e.g., dredging) which could impact a public water supply. This effort would aid in reevaluating the monitoring frequency at the public water supply and preventing impacts to drinking water supplies.

*Atmospheric Approaches*

Conduct research initiative to investigate atmospheric sources of PCBs, characterize PCB concentrations in atmospheric deposition to the watershed and Bay, and determine the significance of these sources for bioaccumulation in fish. As a part of this study, homolog distribution profiles for PCBs in atmospheric deposition would be evaluated to determine whether mid-weight congeners are present at levels that significantly contribute to bioaccumulation in fish.

EPA conducts an on-going National-scale Air Toxics Assessments (NATA). The 2005 NATA included PCBs as a pollutant.  However, PCBs were not a risk driver in Region 3 in 2005. The 2011 NATA is expected to be released during summer 2015 and a review of this newer data will be completed to identify areas of concern in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

Combustion creates some amount of PCBs, even when it is not in the feed. The amount that is generated will vary with the feed material and the design and operation of the combustor (e.g., hazardous waste incinerator, municipal waste combustor, medical waste incinerators) but design and operating practices can be used to minimize PCB formation.  For well-operated systems, the emitted amounts are extremely low, but they are usually detectable. Monitoring studies similar to the ones conducted in the Delaware Estuary (<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1352231007006437>) could be used to track sources of air-borne emissions of PCBs in the Chesapeake Bay watershed

Smaller combustion sources, such as residential wood stoves, fireplaces and backyard trash burning, by themselves, may not have any measurable impacts on the Chesapeake Bay. However, the sheer number of them, combined with their poor dispersion characteristics, might make these sources, when aggregated, a measureable source of deposition to the Bay or to smaller sub-watersheds. An evaluation of these sources in the Chesapeake Bay watershed could be considered as part of a future source track-down study.

*In-stream Sediment Approaches*

Effective management of PCB contaminated in-stream sediments is often challenging. Many PCB contaminated sediments can be large-scale, measured in acres, river miles, or tons of sediment. The sheer volume and mass of PCB contaminated in-stream sediments makes the application of remediation options a difficult task. The implementation of a comprehensive risk management strategy is even more complex. Management of these sites is further complicated by the fact that many of the sediments also contain other chemicals of concern, including polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, metals, and pesticides. The time required to design and implement a management strategy and to evaluate the need for in-stream sediment remediation might reasonably range from years to decades.

The paramount consideration for PCB-contaminated sediment sites should be the management of overall risks to humans and the environment rather than the selection of a remediation technology (e.g., dredging, capping or natural attenuation).

Recognizing the challenge of these contaminated in-stream sediments, an initial goal for this portion of the strategy is to assess the information that is available and forthcoming (e.g., the characterization of Anacostia river sediments by DC Department of Environment) that describes the most highly contaminated in-stream sediments in the watershed and to engage the jurisdictions and federal regulators in exploring the feasibility of additional remedial actions such as capping and/or dredging. The TCW will conduct a workshop on sediment remediation technologies to provide the latest information on ongoing remediation activities in the watershed, recent developments in remediation options, and the costs associated with remediation.

In addition, a project is underway to determine the relative amount of PCB reduction that might occur across the range of BMPs implemented for the Chesapeake Bay nutrient and sediment TMDL, which will also establish opportunities to reduce the volume of sediment entering surface waters. The BMPs will be cross-correlated with contaminant loading mechanisms and their association with land use and industrial sources (e.g., urban stormwater, agriculture, landfills, dredged material disposal facilities, hazardous waste sites, and industrial operations). The study will assess and explain the most beneficial management actions that could leverage current TMDLs and watershed implementation plans (WIPs) to achieve multiple benefits for nutrient, sediment, and toxic contaminant reductions. Combined with other activities discussed in this strategy, it is expected that future sediment inputs will have lower PCB concentrations thereby improving the quality of overlaying sediments.

*Contaminated Site Approaches*

Regulatory Approaches

Investigate whether risk assessment requirements under contaminated site regulations to evaluate potential carcinogenic effects from fish consumption by comparing ambient surface water concentrations of PCBs with human health criterion.

Programmatic Approaches

Develop inventory of existing contaminated site PCB concentration data in all environmental media and compile all available information from governmental and academic organizations. This inventory will demonstrate the widespread extent of PCB contamination in contaminated sites and the need for a high resolution monitoring requirement to support TMDL development and implementation.

the

HSCD will continue to evaluate sites in the Chesapeake Watershed with TCW participation in identifying industries or processes that used PCBs. Once this list is generated, the CERCLA, Brownfields, and RCRA programs can better focus resources on identifying and investigating these types of sites. As significant sources of PCBs, or other contaminants that are migrating into the watershed from contaminated land sources are discovered, HSCD will share this information as part of the progress monitoring of this strategy. Additionally, if there are potential land sources that other programs have found, HSCD can investigate those potential sources under the appropriate authority.

**6.a** **Local Engagement**

In the more urbanized areas of the Bay, Baltimore, Washington D.C. and Norfolk/Elizabeth River, the TCW will continually coordinate and engage with NGOs and state and local governments as the management strategy is developed and implemented.

Recognizing that the general public and, even, local professionals do not understand well the extent and impact of PCBs and toxics contamination of their waterways, the management strategy will seek to raise baseline awareness with respect to the presence and extent of PCBs contamination in local communities, known and potential human health impact (especially with respect to fish consumption practices), and the sources and transport dynamics of PCBs contamination. The TCW will identify and prioritize communities for targeted outreach, based upon known levels of contamination, known and assumed levels of awareness, and known and assumed community risk of exposure.

Working with local government and non-profit organizations, the TCW will develop communications materials and corresponding procedures for their dissemination throughout the targeted communities. Building upon the fish contamination data collection and assessment efforts of state fish consumption advisory programs and through the aggregation of local/state/federal data on known sources of PCBs, the communications materials will expand upon and provide more and better narrative description about PCBs and toxics contamination of local waterways, the sources and transport dynamics of the PCBs (best available research), and more extensive explanation and interpretation about human health risks from fish consumption-based exposure (best available research). The materials will include individual watershed/jurisdiction reports as well as presentation materials for use by local government and non-profit employees for dissemination in various venues (e.g. neighborhood association meetings, classrooms, etc.). The TCW will also make the communications materials available online.

The TCW will also organize, through the assistance and guidance of PCBs experts and academic researchers, several training workshops for local government and non-profit employees to gain technical capacity for the monitoring and investigation of PCBs sources within their respective jurisdictions. The workshop will present several different approaches to source-tracking PCBs, including consideration of various factors (e.g. varying land use; financial resources; stormwater infrastructure, etc.). The workshops will present best practices for conducting chemical and biological source tracking of watershed PCBs sources, as well as best practices for conducting historical (e.g. what public and private records to review, how to access those records, etc.) and community-participatory research (i.e. survey community members for knowledge about current and historic formal/informal dumping sites that could be a source of PCBs contamination and pursuing/promoting/facilitating clean-up of vacant/under-utilized former industrial sites). The TCW will work with local non-profits to explore the use of volunteers to support the work of PCBs source-tracking, identifying the best opportunities for volunteers to receive technical training to support PCBs field sampling activities (e.g. volunteer MS4 outfall sampling programs such as Blue Water Baltimore’s Outfall Screening Blitz) and community-participatory research into local environmental history.

1. **Monitoring Progress.**

Three types of progress monitoring will be pursued:

1. Progress on completion of planned activities for actions not directly under the direction of the Partnership and progress for activities for which the TCW is directly committing to oversight and dedication of resources of the Partnership. Examples include items in the TCW biennial workplan and jurisdiction progress with TMDL and PMP development.
2. Assessment of whether planned actions are having the result expected. Examples could include trends in the restrictiveness of fish consumption advisories, PCB concentrations in stormwater and wastewater effluents, extent of impairments and calculated estimates of load reductions.
3. Environmental monitoring to track response of the system as the strategy is implemented (to the extent possible given the high cost of PCB monitoring and the lag time that will influence how quickly an environmental response is detectable). Examples include fish tissue PCB concentrations for indicator species, and sediment concentrations.
4. **Assessing Progress**

For type 1) progress monitoring as described above, the frequency of assessing progress will be at least annual so that adjustments to the biennial workplan can be made to accommodate changing circumstances and availability of resources. Formal review of type 1) progress data will be completed through the update of the biennial workplan.

Progress assessment based on type 2) and 3) monitoring will be conducted on an as-available basis. These types of monitoring generally will involve measurements of environmental response and environmental condition, which do not necessarily occur at regular intervals and will be contingent on availability of data and/or monitoring funds.

1. **Adaptively Manage**

Adaptive management will focus foremost on monitoring information described under type 2) above where there will be assessment of whether management actions are having the expected results in terms of PCB reductions. Over time, it is expected the TCW will learn which loading mechanisms and sources provide the greatest opportunities for continued reductions.

Other adaptations to the strategy will result from assessing the long term response of the system (type 3 monitoring above) and, in the short term, whether the TCW and other entities are completing work as planned (type 1 monitoring above).

1. **Biennial Workplan** *summarize the commitments, actions and resources that each jurisdiction, federal agency and partner will take to help achieve each of the outcomes*

Biennial workplan to be developed