

Toxic Contaminants Workgroup

February 10, 2016 Conference Call 1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Chesapeake Bay Program Office - Room 305a

Minutes

Welcome, Introductions, Announcements

- STAC Optimization Workshop
 - o TCW will have representatives at the workshop on February 17-18.
- Track-down Studies Guidance Funding (*P&P*; *Approach 4, Key Action 1*)
 - o TCW was able to secure \$10k in funding through a Tetra Tech contract. Contract scope covers a literature review, interviews with those who have successfully conducted track down studies, and delivery of a document summarizing best practices for track down studies.
- Fish Consumption Project proposal received
- Chesapeake Water Environment Association has a seminar scheduled for June 8, focused on toxic contaminants in Chesapeake Bay. Call for participants and abstracts is out and we would like to have a strong presence at the workshop. We will be coordinating with CWEA in the coming days. Deadline for abstracts is February 29th.

<u>Overview of Wildlife Research and Discussion of Priorities</u> -- Natalie Karouna, USGS and Scott Phillips, USGS

Workplan: Research; Approach 2, Key Action 3

Natalie Karouna provided an overview of toxic contaminant information for wildlife in the Bay watershed. After the presentation, Scott asked the TCW to help USGS prioritize wildlife groups (i.e. birds, amphibians, etc.) for future USGS research.

Discussion:

ACTION: TCW members should send Natalie citations for any studies that might have been missed in the initial USGS literature review dealing with toxic contaminant and wildlife in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

• Phillips: USGS would like to start up a wildlife component of their EDC study and would appreciate TCW input on where to focus that research. Are there sentinel species for your agency? Species of value, economically or in the trophic

level? Studies you currently have underway on fish that would benefit by understanding the links to another taxa?

o Mark Richards (VA DEQ): The PCB and osprey study was really useful and show changes over time. Information like that is extremely useful. I don't know of any specific examples. This is information that helps us, but doesn't necessarily drive the action in our agency.

ACTION: TCW members should contact their wildlife experts and provide any feedback to Scott or Natalie regarding wildlife taxa of interest for future EDC studies.

- John Schneider (DE DNREC): Osprey is very useful because of the connection to forage fish.
- Dave Montali (WV DEP): Our focus is generally on fish rather than wildlife.
 - o George Onyullo (DOEE): Same in the District.
- Fred Pinkney (FWS): My preference is towards studies on amphibians, particularly in urban/suburban areas. There are a number of urban fertilizers and pesticides being used and it would be great to know how healthy those urban and suburban amphibian habitats are.
- Greg Allen (EPA): As far as how to prioritize, some of these wildlife taxa have
 very limited exposure pathways in terms of figuring where the contaminants
 might occur. Birds and mammal exposure pathways would be through food
 consumption whereas amphibians and reptiles might have more diverse exposure
 pathways, especially amphibians. Maybe that could be one thing to think about as
 far as prioritizing.
 - Dan Jones (USGS-CERC): I tend to agree with Greg. I think aquatic exposure pathways are probably where we have the highest degree of information and confidence. Looking at amphibians and maybe some select reptiles would be a higher priority because of their risk for potential exposure. Something like that would probably tie into existing studies pretty easily.

Workplan Planning Calendar -- Greg Allen, EPA

Workplan: Policy and Prevention

Greg led a discussion to help plan Policy and Prevention workplan activities over the next two years. The TCW was asked to help identify priorities, and potential resources to help the workgroup achieve the actions laid out in the workplan.

Discussion:

Allen: While we wait for public comments on the workplans, we want to begin
moving forward on them. We have created new versions of the workplan
spreadsheets that include a status column to help us track our progress towards
achieving our performance targets and key actions.

- Major hurdle for achieving the action to coordinate a voluntary program for PCBcontaining equipment replacement were a lack of a project lead, and lack of incentives for equipment owners.
 - Suggestions were to start with federal owners of PCB containing equipment, and to reach out to the Alliance for the Chesapeake and ask about potential links with their Businesses for the Bay program.
 - Another next step was to talk with EPA to determine the location of PCB containing transformers.
- Next steps for the GIS Story map:
 - Meet with the CBP communications team to discuss how best to present the maps.
 - o Micka Peck (EPA, WPD) volunteered to draft the story text for the maps.
- Phillips: Is there any chance we drop any of these items from the workplan for which we clearly have no resources at this point in time?
 - It was suggested that we reevaluate one last time during the March meeting to make a final decision regarding how to address key actions with no identified resources.

Wrap-up and Next Steps -- Greg Allen, EPA and Scott Phillips, USGS

List of Call Participants

Member	Affiliation	
Greg Allen (Coordinator)	EPA, CBPO	
Scott Phillips (Coordinator)	USGS	
David Wood (Staff)	CRC	
Marel King	CBC	
Kathy Richter	CERC	
John Schneider	DE DNREC	
Krista Parra	DOD	
George Onyullo	DOEE	
Gretchen Kroeger	Duke University	
Lorie Baker	EPA, HSCD	
Jen Sincock	EPA, WPD	
Micka Peck	EPA, WPD	
Fred Pinkney	FWS	
Chris Burbage	HRSD	
Bruce Michael	MD DNR	
Sherm Garrison	MD DNR	
Dinorah Dalmasy	MDE	
Tim Rule	MDE	
Lana Sindler	MWCOG	
Ian Hartwell	NOAA	
Tom Barron	PA DEP	

Upal Ghosh	UMBC
Vicky Blazer	USGS
Kelly Smalling	USGS
Dan Jones	USGS
Paula Henry	USGS
Natalie Karouna-Renier	USGS
Mary Foley	USGS
Barnett Rattner	USGS
Rebecca Lazarus	USGS
Mark Richards	VA DEQ
Don Smith	VA DEQ
Dave Montali	WV DEP