

CBP Water Quality Goal Implementation Team
Toxic Contaminants Workgroup
Meeting Minutes

Date: Wednesday, June 13, 2020

Time: 1:00 - 3:00 PM

Calendar Page: [Link](#).



Agenda Item and Desired Outcome	Time	Background Docs, Notes, and Action Items
1. Introductions and Announcements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approval of the April Meeting Minutes 	1:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete the Mercury Story Map documentation (post- meeting note: this is completed) Complete the toxic contaminant indicator Update the PCB Story Map
2. Review of CBP response to STAC comments on Contaminants Workshop: Scott Phillips and Emily Majcher	1:10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft of response posted to calendar page.
3. Research Outcome —Scott Phillips and Emily Majcher, USGS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Next Steps Narrative Analysis 	2:15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TCW SRS Review Schedule
4. Policy and Prevention Outcome – Greg Allen, EPA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Next Steps Narrative Analysis 	1:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TCW SRS Review Schedule
5. Wrap Up and Adjourn	3:00	<i>Next meeting: July 8, 2020</i>

Summary of Actions and Decisions

Decision: TCW approved the April meeting minutes

Action: Scott Phillips will edit CBPs response to STAC’s recommendations for the CEC Report and send to TCW for their review. The TCW will ask for final approval at their July meeting with the goal of elevating this to the WQGIT for their July 27th meeting.

Action: Hilary Swartwood will send the TCW’s GIT Funding Project proposal to the TCW members for their review.

Meeting Minutes

1. Introductions and Announcements

- a. CBP is going to release a blog on the CEC STAC Workshop this week.
- b. **Decision:** TCW approved the April meeting minutes
- 2. **Review of CBP Response to STAC Comments on CEC Workshop:**
 - a. CBP Action 1: Enhance interaction with Audiences for Contaminant Information
 - i. No initial response
 - b. CBP Action 2: Take advantage of Phase 3 Implementation
 - i. No initial response
 - c. CBP Action 3: Prepare Communication Materials to Inform Decisions
 - i. No initial response
 - d. CBP Action 4: Compile results and expand BMP studies
 - i. *Suggestion:* highlight some ongoing studies, for example the work being done on the Anacostia River by DC.
 - e. CBP Action 5: Include selected BMP results in CBP tools
 - i. *George Onyullo:* I think so far, you should look at the way BMPs are used from the Bay perspective. For the most part they target nutrients and sediment. Any benefit that derives from BMP implementation is viewed. From the perspective of TC's it's a co-benefit. So, we should be very clear that the way we view BMP performance is relative to how the BMPs are performing with respect to sediment and nutrients (and mostly sediment since that's where the TC's are located). I think we need to start to think about how optimization may be helpful to reducing TC's.
 - ii. *Scott Phillips:* The BMP optimization tool- is that a tool that already exists?
 - iii. *George Onyullo:* I think Jeni Keisman in the Modeling Workgroup is developing this tool. It would be good to position our interests as the tool is developed to make sure that TC's are included.
 - iv. *Scott Phillips:* Good to know, we will reword some of this to include your thoughts.
 - v. *Greg Allen:* There is a disconnect between Action 4 and Action 5 about using BMPs. I think in action 5 we need to say more about what we are going to do to ensure the Chesapeake Bay Program includes TC's in their tools.
 - vi. *Scott Phillips:* The problem is that we have tried for 4 years to get them included into the CBP tools and nothing has happened.
 - vii. *Greg Allen:* I think it could parrot what is in the GIT funding project proposal since that was in the top 4. We may need to have a section that say this is what we want to do, and this is what we need from the CBP to make these things happen.
 - viii. *George Onyullo:* I support what Greg is saying from Action 4. There was one time that Tetra Tech did a BMP co-benefit study/ report. I think this could be tied into action 4 and note that at the time it was written it did not include TC's but now we may want to revisit this study and try to extend the study to accommodate our own interests.
 - ix. *Leonard Schugam:* For Action 4, we could also include work that MD and DC are doing in the Anacostia and expand the scope of this action item. In the CBT we found that none of the PCB studies are being funded this year.
 - x. *Scott Phillips:* Is that something we want to reflect in the letter?
 - xi. *Leonard Schugam:* MD wouldn't be able to comment on that per se but maybe you could reach out to CBT for more information, or I can send that information to you.
 - xii. *Scott Phillips:* That would be good. Maybe we could say something about pursuing this further. We will send out the new draft before the July 8th meeting so that we can hopefully present this to WQGIT at their July meeting.
 - xiii. **Action:** Scott Phillips will edit CBPs response to STAC's recommendations for the CEC Report and send to TCW for their review. The TCW will ask for final approval at their July meeting with the goal of elevating this to the WQGIT for their July 27th meeting.

- f. GIT Funding Project: there was an extension for submitting Table 1 to CBT. The deadline is now June 22nd. Hilary will forward the rankings and the WQGIT email with table 1 to the TCW leadership team.
 - i. **Action**: Hilary Swartwood will send the TCW's GIT Funding Project proposal to the TCW members for their review.

3. Research Outcome

a. Discussion:

- i. *Scott Phillips*: We are looking for all of you to provide feedback on the narrative analysis in the next couple of weeks.
- ii. *George Onyullo*: I think this is an interesting figure (referring to narrative analysis). We should modify the Y axis a little to capture how knowledge is accumulated and translated into action. In my view that should be Knowledge adequate to essentialize impacts (after this then policy can be implemented). This is just based on my experience.
- iii. *Scott Phillips*: Could you explain the impact space?
- iv. *George Onyullo*: The reason why the TMDL is in place is because people realized there was no fish. Once impact is real it is easier for decision makers to make a change based on the push from stakeholders. Our goal should always be to essentialize the impacts because then it's easier to use those impacts to create policy.
- v. *Scott Phillips*: when you say "essentialize impacts," examples would be fish advisories?
- vi. *George Onyullo*: Yes, however it is a difficult thing to put together and communicate to people.
- vii. *Marel King*: It is not so much the amount of information/ knowledge that is available but really the type of knowledge. It should be actionable knowledge, or knowledge that we can do something about because then it can create a behavior change or policy decision.
- viii. *Emily Majcher*: The intent here was to say that each of our management approaches is tied to a knowledge gap. With that management approach we are making the assumption that the actions under this strategy should lead us to actionable decisions.
- ix. *Vicki Blazer*: I think one of the issues is that the fisherman see certain things, but it's really hard (and probably not scientific) to put that one way or another. You can't always have it one chemical one problem, which is the issue.
- x. *Scott*: The mixture of chemicals in the ag and urban landscapes make it hard to come up with a policy when there could be multiple things affecting fish populations.
- xi. *George Onyullo*: Some of these people, when they heard that their fish had plastic in them, you could see it affecting them. It was more impactful than just talking about microplastics. Sometimes you just need a vehicle to drive the point home and it is very difficult to do this in the space that we are operating.
- xii. *Scott Phillips*: As an example, we worked to create that PCB fish consumption guide and what you are saying is if we could create more materials like that, it would be helpful?
- xiii. *George Onyullo*: Yes, I think Marel made the point better than I could. It is one way, although it is not the only way.
- xiv. *Greg Allen*: The question you started here with about whether it was useful- I was thinking of using something similar in the other action plan. I think as a conceptual diagram it is helpful as long as we are clear that there are no measurements attached to it. Once we have our management strategies worded the way we would like them, understanding how we would measure it is a good exercise.
- xv. *George Onyullo*: The way I view impacts internally is different than the way I view impacts externally. PFAS is bubbling up, other than that, I don't think I see anything else that has become more prevalent.
- xvi. *Marel King*: CBC is working on PFAS. The road salt stuff is out there but there isn't any traction at this point.
- xvii. *Scott Phillips*: How about other jurisdictions? Should PFAS be reflected? Please let us know.
- xviii. *Greg Allen*: One other thing that we could add is microplastics- do we consider that part of our universe of concerns, or should we leave it off our radar?

xix. *Scott Phillips*: Since there is the PPAT maybe we acknowledge this team and that we will keep in communication with this group.

xx. *Doug Austin*: I participated on the first call and can act as liaison for TCW.

4. Policy and Prevention Outcome:

- a. Greg Allen reviewed the status of the Policy and Prevention Logic and Action plan and narrative analysis. The TCW did not have any questions at this time.

5. Wrap up and Adjourn

Call Participant List

Hilary Swartwood, CRC

Scott Phillips, USGS

Doug Austin, EPA

John Maleri, DC DOEE

Leonard Schugam, MDE

Marel King, CBC

Mark Richards, VA DEQ

Vicki Blazer, USGS

George Onyullo, DC DOEE

Greg Allen, EPA

Emily Majcher, USGS

Lori Baker, EPA

Greg Voigt