Chesapeake Bay Program
Toxic Contaminants Workgroup (TCW)
Meeting Agenda
Date: Wednesday, February 12th, 2025
Time: 1:00 – 3:00 PM
Location: Conference Call (remote only)
Calendar Page: February Meeting Materials

Chesapeake Bay Program
A Watershed Partnership

Agenda Item, (Lead) and Desired Outcome	Time	Background Docs, Notes, and Action Items
1. Introductions and Announcements (Greg Allen, EPA) • Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Draft per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) Biosolids Risk Assessment • TCW Co-Chair position open • Regrouping on the topic of 6-PPDQ on Brook Trout	1:00	• EPA Draft PFAS Biosolids Risk Assessment (link) • TCW Co-Chair Position Description – a lot of important work to look forward to with the following governance discussion and the next version of the Chesapeake Watershed Agreement. • Meeting on Feb 11th to discuss whether 6-PPDQ is present in the Chesapeake Bay (CB) watershed and specifically in areas where we want to restore Brook Trout populations. USGS has done first round of sampling and analysis in the watershed (urban and rural) and EPA ORD in the Anacostia. Substantial amount of work is underway and there is a reasonable set of work activities to answer this question. USGS will release some data soon. Hopefully we can follow this under our Research outcome and coordinate partner activities.
2. **Beyond 2025 Outcome Evaluations** *(Greg Allen, EPA)* Review the current draft of the outcome evaluation papers for the Chemical Contaminants Goal and both of the related outcomes. Members are asked to provide immediate feedback. A comment period will be open following the distribution of the draft outcome evaluations on February 15th. Additional comments and feedback are requested by February 24th. Final content for the outcome evaluations is	1:10	• Chesapeake Watershed Agreement • We are currently in a period of re-evaluation of executive level goals and strategies for the program. We must do an assessment of our outcomes, document how we are currently adding value to achieve our outcomes, and what does the future look like for our work. We need to deliver our assessments by Feb 27th in advance of our March 13th MB meeting where we will have three minutes to discuss our outcome and recommended changes. Draft assessments will be shared with workgroup members by COB Feb 15th for review. Feedback is due COB Feb 24th.

due to the Management Board (MB) by February 27 and our discussion with the MB will be March 13.		• Goals are not necessarily going to change much, and outcomes will likely have a home within the future of the Bay Program
		
		<u>Toxic Contaminants Research Outcome:</u> *Continually increase our understanding of the impacts and mitigation options for toxic contaminants. Develop a research agenda and further characterize the occurrence, concentrations, sources and effects of mercury, PCBs and other contaminants of emerging and widespread concern. In addition, identify which best management practices might provide multiple benefits of reducing nutrient and sediment pollution as well as toxic contaminants in waterways.*
		• *Recommendation:* ***UPDATE***
		• *Rationale:* we are mostly fulfilling what our outcome sets out – adding to the understanding of issues related to contaminants. We are contributing to our understanding of the current concentrations, sources, and effects. We haven't succeeded in this last portion on identifying Best Management Practices (BMPs) despite our pushes to further this by integrating this into the CAST modeling tool that's used for nutrients and sediment. This is mostly due to the lack of data around the efficiencies of BMPs with regards to TC. This might be the one area where we can change the language. Additionally, the Clean Water Act section 117 establishes a requirement for a coordinated toxic reduction strategy among the partnership.
		• *Value added:*
		  ○ George Onyullo: insert after "In addition [continue to support research effort to identify . . .]". This ties in with how TCW adds value to the CBP.
		  ○ Ruth Cassilly: we should connect the BMPs that build soil health and the BMPs that reduce Toxic contaminants. There is a push to include soil health in an outcome in the BCP moving forward. We might be able to build on scaling up the soil health effort and the co-benefit of beyond load reductions but also toxic contaminants filtration in the soil. There still needs to be research on this, and we can add more value by proposing this.

		▪ Greg Allen: There is conversations in the CBPO of creating a soil health outcome that we might be interested in connecting with – we just have to think about what that would look like. • *What have we learned:* We learned that the science needs are dynamic for emerging contaminants such as PFAS and 6-PPD-quinone as well as for known contaminants such as Mercury and PCBs, among others (please refer to the 2-pager for the full list). • *Oncoming activities include:* PFAS methodology and Assessment to support fish consumption advisors, assess the effects of contaminants on fish and shellfish in tidal waters, and continue to investigate previously prioritized issues of emerging concerns including microplastics, 6-PPDQ and road salts (chloride) among others (please refer to the 2-pager for the full list). ○ George Onyullo: I do not know if road salts can be considered an "emerging concern". The discussion has always been around the difficulty of finding a practical solution to this, but it has always been a concern. I think 6PPD-q and microplastics are better suited for "emerging concern" than road salts. ○ Tish Robertson: we do have regulations for chloride and the ecological impact is well understood. I think road salts is mostly an issue with policy. Here is a link to the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VA DEQ) Salt management Strategy. ○ Ruth Cassilly: There is room for a lot of improvement to road salt application at a policy perspective. Maybe this will fit better into the TCW Policy & Prevention Outcome? ○ Len Schugam: MD Salt Management Resources (link). ○ ***Decision:*** Strikethrough on "road salts" for the two-pager document, potentially keeping this in the workplan. • *Summary:* We must keep this element in the Executive level agreement. Forecasting of the updated language includes expressly calling out some pollutants that will be of primary focus, like 6-PPDQ and PFAS. ○ Emily Majcher: Management Approach 5 (MA5) is related to issues of emerging concern, rather than emerging contaminants. Subtle but

		important distinction. Also, 6-PPDQ sits solely in MA5, so not sure it should be called out explicitly with PFAS above. • ***Action item:*** Review Toxic Contaminants Research Outcome Assessment Document and provide any comments/suggestions. <u>Toxic Contaminants Policy & Prevention Outcome:</u> *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.* • *Recommendation:* ***UPDATE*** • *Rationale:* We recommend ***updating*** to ensure that the CBP continues to apply its extensive expertise in water quality management to advance PCB TMDL's in the watershed. We need to also consider how we can make this outcome more <u>S</u>pecific, <u>M</u>easurable, <u>A</u>chievable, <u>R</u>elevant, <u>T</u>imebound (SMART). • *Value added:* TCW provides a forum for any needed interstate coordination among the watershed jurisdictions on PCB TMDLs, opportunities for the jurisdiction PCB TMDL leads to learn from other programs both within the watershed and around the country who are actively working to reduce PCBS, and watershed wide story maps, indicators and communication pieces, among others (please refer to the 2-pager for the full list). ○ Tish Robertson: the map of impairments is misleading as it is missing important context from Maryland (MD) and VA – they do not use the same information, the same thresholds. Someone can look at the the map and think VA is completely contaminated with PCBs. The Health Department in VA issues the criteria and it is based on abundance of caution and not monitoring data. ○ Len Schugam: This doesn't list the migratory fish. Instead, we should consider demonstrating a map of Fish Consumption Advisories in addition to the BMP listing and TMDL development. The Fish Consumption Advisory would be throughout the entire main stem.

		○ ***Action item:*** Look into mapping of Fish Consumption Advisory. Maybe ask USGS to do a mockup for us. • *What have we learned:* This is a dynamic loading situation that needs management intervention so that we can speed up the reduction of PCBs and fish. It comes through stormwater and wastewater sources and contaminants in stream sediment. Atmospheric fluxes create a classic pollutant biogeochemical processing cycle. We have learned that we can make progress based on select case-studies like Maryland, where they are working with local governments in MS4 areas where there is a PCB TMDL to conduct source tracking and mitigation. Additionally, Virginia is completing a very large scale TMDL on the James River with a strategic direction to use permit limits to drive PCB reductions (please refer to the 2-pager for the full list). • *Activities underway:* Large-scale PCB remediation activities (James River PCB TMDL, Anacostia Remediation), Assessing the effectiveness of the Advance Restoration Plan Framework, Support jurisdiction/EPA regulatory coordination in PCB TMDLs, and Local Government collaboration as stakeholders have indicated needs related to PCBs and PFAS. ○ Tom Parham: there is currently work underway at the CBP for Living Resources targeting efforts and this ties in with the CESAR report. Restoring fish nutrients and sediment reduction doesn't mean that we will improve fish habitat, there can be other things like endocrine disruptors. The CESAR report allows us to look outside the box in addition to focusing on shallow waters. This might be an angle that we could utilize. • *Summary:* fulfill the CBP chartered mission and achieve the partnership's vision. Improve the practices and controls that reduce and prevent effects 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 and leverage the TMDLs that are in place. Use research findings to evaluate implementation of additional policies, programs and practices for other contaminants that need to be reduced or eliminated. • ***Action item:*** Review Toxic Contaminants Policy & Prevention Outcome Assessment Document and provide any comments/suggestions.

3. Brainstorming New Directions, Cross-Outcome Synergies and Changes to the Outcome Language	2:25	• Meeting materials will be added to the Calendar page when available.
Wrap Up and Adjourn	2:55	**Next meeting: March 12th, 2025**

Attendance:

Greg Allen (EPA), Gabriel Duran (CRC), Douglas Austin (EPA), Nick Murray (WV DEP), Josh Lookenbill (PA DEP), Tom Parham (MD DNR), Tish Robertson (VA DEQ), Mark Hoffman (CBC), Len Schugam (MDE), Tony Timpano (VA DEQ), Brooke Kline (USGS), Raquel Wetzell (USFWS), Ruth Cassilly (UMD CBPO), Anna McClain (USGS), Emily Majcher (USGS), Vicki Blazer (USGS), Jamie Mitchell (HRSD), George Onyullo (DOEE), Tamie Veith (USDA), Heather Elise Preisendanz (PSU), Sushanth Gupta (MWCOG), Benoit Van Aken (GMU).