

**CBP Water Quality Goal Implementation Team**  
**Toxic Contaminants Workgroup**  
**Meeting Agenda**

**Date:** Wednesday, September 9, 2020  
**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>
<b>1. Introductions and Announcements</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approval of the August meeting minutes</li> <li>Update on TCW Membership List</li> <li>Recently Published Articles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Bioaccumulation of Mercury in Fish Varied by Species and Location</a></li> <li><a href="#">Forever chemicals found in Chesapeake Region Freshwater Fish</a></li> </ul> </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="#">Update the TCW Membership List</a></li> </ul>
<b>2. GIT Funding Project (dry-run)</b> – Scott Phillips and Emily Majcher, USGS	1:10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GIT Funding Project Presentation</li> </ul>
<b>3. Toxic Contaminant Indicator</b> – Hilary Swartwood, CRC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did anything change in tidal states/ jurisdictions integrated assessment reports?</li> </ul>	1:30	
<b>4. Revising Research Management Strategy and Logic and Action Plan</b> –Scott Phillips and Emily Majcher, USGS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overview from Management Board Meeting</li> <li>Discussion of PFAS activities</li> <li>Review of current actions and opportunity to update</li> </ul>	2:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TCW <a href="#">SRS Review Schedule</a></li> <li>TCW <a href="#">Research Management Strategy</a></li> <li>TCW Research Logic and Action Plan</li> </ul>
<b>5. Wrap Up and Adjourn</b>	3:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Next meeting: October 14, 2020</b></li> </ul>

**Summary of Actions and Decisions**

**Decision:** TCW approved the August meeting minutes.

**Action:** Members should specify the lead contact for their jurisdiction/ organization (this is the person listed on the TCW webpage and is expected to participate in meetings). Hilary Swartwood will send out the current list to the TCW post- meeting for their review.

**Action:** TCW Leadership will incorporate feedback into the Research Logic and Action Plan and send to the TCW members for their review.

**Meeting Minutes**

## 1. Introduction

- **Decision:** TCW Approval of August Meeting Minutes
- **Action:** Members should specify the lead contact for their jurisdiction/ organization (this is the person listed on the TCW webpage and is expected to participate in meetings). Hilary Swartwood will send out the current list to the TCW post- meeting.

## 2. GIT Funding Project

- *Discussion:*
  - i. *Fred Pickney:* I would switch out picture of bullhead and use a “do not eat fish” advisory sign. I would also consider limiting the number of bullets on your project steps slide.

## 3. Toxic Contaminant Indicator

- John Cargill still is the rep for DE

## 4. Revising Research Management Strategy and LAP

- **MA1:**
  - i. *George Onyullo:* I think it’s important to think about the network because if we don’t have the network in place then it ends up not working. So, we need to put effort into defining what an integrated network would look like and making sure the data we get from that fits into the integration.
  - ii. *Scott Phillips:* great points George.
  - iii. *George Onyullo:* if you write an article there is a lot that isn’t put into and it would be good to get this information.
  - iv. *Scott Phillips:* Do you think we can reach out to Collin to get this?
  - v. *Kelly Smalling:* I think it would be a great idea to get Collin to present his recent article. Let me reach out to him and get back to you, Scott.
  - vi. *Scott Phillips:* In the meantime, we can resend the article to everyone to refresh our memories.
  - vii. *John Cargill:* I will throw out an idea of generating a hierarchy of preferred use so there is some consistency in data to make cross-boundary comparison easier.
  - viii. *Emily Majcher:* I agree, and I think that would make it easier. I like your idea of having a hierarchy for these types of decisions or studies.
  - ix. *John Cargill:* We don’t allow the use of 80-81 or 80-82 anymore. It’s not a terrible idea if we can help with that.
  - x. *Scott Phillips:* So we will put in some sort of action to develop a hierarchy of preferred uses. We will put it in as a possible idea and once we write it out everyone can review it.
- **MA2:**
  - i. *Scott Phillips:* Kelly Smalling do you have any updates?
  - ii. *Kelly Smalling:* I am hoping it is a one-year effort. There is at least a handful of articles that would be of interest in this group. Whatever we need to include related to CEC studies, I can work to flesh that out.
  - iii. *Scott Phillip:* Fred, I wanted to see were USFWS stands?
  - iv. *Fred Pinkney:* We have another round of fish tissue study that will be completed in the next year. My main focus is working on an Anacostia sediment project. This may be more related to the TC Policy and Prevention LAP, but will we be addressing PCBs at all? How are we going to follow up on the recommendations of the STAC report?
  - v. *Emily Majcher:* I know there has been some follow up on schools with the light ballasts, Doug might know more.
  - vi. *Dough Austin:* We are trying to move forward on that. I actually called a guy from State of Washington who may be a contact and we are trying to put a plan together to get that going.

- vii. *Scott Phillips*: We will be discussing this more at the next meeting. With PFAS, each jurisdiction is doing some work, but I am not sure how much of this is focused on effects on fish and wildlife. Are any jurisdictions looking into this?
- viii. *George Onyullo*: I can sort of chime in for DC. Basically, we just need to have a good handle on what the current status is until we venture into the effects on wildlife. Right now, I don't know if this has been established but I could be wrong.
- ix. *Scott Phillips*: In PA are you looking into PFAS in wildlife at all?
- x. *Matt Kundrat*: We are in a transitional phase on this. The first phase was conducting a survey to see where PFAS is in PA and the follow up was to look at hotspots first to see where it is in fish. We haven't started this work yet. But we are going to start with the most contaminated PFAS sites and then issue advisories as appropriate.
- xi. *Scott Phillips*: Kelly Smalling do you know of any work?
- xii. *Kelly Smalling*: Vicki has some work looking at PFAS in plasma and has identified some PFAS in our agriculture integrator sights. She has detected PFAS in plasma and using the data to look into potential health effects. We are also doing some work in the cape cod area at an old army base on PFAS effects in bass. There is also work being done on PFAS in birds and potential health effects. My gut says that we have done more work on occurrence rather than effects. By September 2021 we should have a map available of different sources of PFAS. We would be happy to bring that to the group.
- xiii. *John Cargill*: On the remediation side, we have been identifying potential sources and occurrence and it's a primary concern for the drinking water sources. In 2019 was the first time we sampled for PFAS in all our watersheds. In the Chesapeake we are looking at bass/sunfish and catfish samples and we are adding it to our regular checklist for sampling. It is important to understand that PFAS operates a little differently so I think we should be sampling other parts of the fish besides the edible portions to understand where else these contaminants are located.
- xiv. *Emily Majcher*: Does it make sense similarly through the comments about the PCB methodology? I know everyone is facing questions and challenges on the PFAS methods as well and certainly water is more straight forward than fish and sediment. We could consider something similar to what we talked about with PCBs to compile some recommendations or hierarchy so we can compare across boundaries.
- xv. *George Onyullo*: I think that is a good point. I think that would be a challenge too, but it would be good to do this.
- xvi. *John Cargill*: When I was processing this data, I spent some time watching videos and webinars on the best way to present the data.
- xvii. *Emily Majcher*: Lee Blaney is doing quite a bit of occurrence work on PFAS and biosolids.

- **MA3:**

- i. *George Onyullo*: When we talk about PFAS occurrence are we targeting the development of a map like this.
- ii. *Emily Majcher*: This is an impairment map; I don't think anyone is evaluating PFAS in this context at that time.
- iii. *Scott Phillips*: I think we experienced some concentrated point data that would be hard to display.
- iv. *Emily Majcher*: It is a good idea to have a visual aid, like a map, to show this information.
- v. *Marel King*: In PA in the Philadelphia region there was a funding legislation that would divert some tax revenues from this site that would go directly towards the clean up of this site. It's not necessarily related to the Bay but it's a new and different way to clean up some of these sites.
- vi. *Emily Majcher*: Anything in the stream work that USGS is doing is relevant?
- vii. *Kelly Smalling*: We are gearing up on looking at taking a holistic approach to analysis BMPs and their biologic response mostly in the ag area but there will definitely be co-benefits.

- **MA4:**

- i. *Scott Phillips*: Some of that would be in our last Management approach- issues of emerging concern. This could be a place for more of that. Just to let you know, next week I will be presenting our responses to STAC CEC Report to the MB.
- **MA5:**
  - i. Scott Phillips: Is it too much to keep up with so many emerging issues and focus on a select few, especially,
  - ii. **Action:** TCW Leadership will incorporate feedback into the Research Logic and Action Plan and send to the TCW members for their review.