This meeting is recorded for internal use to ensure the accuracy of the meeting minutes

CBP Water Quality Goal Implementation Team
Toxic Contaminants Workgroup
Meeting Agenda

Date: *Wednesday, July 14, 2021*
Time: 1:00 - 3:00 PM
Location: Conference Call (remote only)
Calendar Page: Link.

Chesapeake Bay Program
A Watershed Partnership

Meeting Information*

Meeting link: https://umces.webex.com/umces/j.php?MTID=mb652131fb56271918690029b3d7d2eb0

Meeting number: 120 121 0049

Password: 8294

OR

Phone: 1-408-418-9388 United States Toll

Access code: 120 121 0049

**Please join by either computer audio or phone, not both. Viewing the webinar in the desktop app is recommended over the web browser. If experiencing bandwidth issues, turning off video when not speaking is recommended.*

Agenda Item and Desired Outcome	Time	Background Docs, Notes, and Action Items
1. Introductions and Announcements • Freshwater methamphetamine pollution turns brown trout into addicts ○ New article in the *Journal of Experimental Biology* found that "after isolating brown trout in a tank of water laced with 1 µg l^{-1} methamphetamine (a level that has been found in freshwater rivers) for 8 weeks… [they ended up] selecting water containing the drug as they suffered withdrawal during the first 4 days after moving to freshwater." • WQGIT approved minor edits to their Governance Protocols		• Complete the toxic contaminant indicator • Update the PCB Story Map • Send contaminants in ag watersheds story map link to TCW once published. • TCW leadership will reach out to contact leads for EPA's Executive Council on PFAS to share information / invite them to participate in STAC PFAS Workshop. • TCW will be added to an upcoming AgWG agenda to present on TCs in Ag watersheds. • TCW will create a 2- page monitoring factsheet for STAR
2. STAR Microplastics Science Strategy Briefing – Matt Robinson, DOEE Matt Robinson will give a 15- minute toxic contaminant- focused briefing on the Microplastics Science Strategy to the TCW followed by 15 minutes of discussion. Comments on the draft	1:15	• Microplastics Science Strategy Link

strategy are due **COB Thursday, July 15, 2021,** to Matthew Robinson (matthew.robinson@dc.gov).		
3. STAR Coordination for Integrated Monitoring Networks- Emily Majcher and Scott Phillips, USGS • Inventory of available toxic contaminant data – Emily Majcher, USGS • Items needed for 2- page Monitoring Factsheet (first draft due in August) • Suggested objectives for toxic contaminants monitoring: addressing items named in the research outcome (PCBs, Mercury, other contaminants of widespread and emerging concern) – Scott Phillips, USGS • Feedback from TCW on objectives	1:45	• Presentation • Mentimeter (ranking bullet three)
4. Wrap Up and Adjourn	2:50	• ***Next meeting:* Wednesday, August 11, 2021**

Summary of Actions and Decisions:

Action: TCW will continue to refine the proposed monitoring objectives utilizing the information provided on the Jamboard.

Meeting Minutes:

1. **Introduction and Announcements**
   - **a.** *Dave Whitall:* NOAA dataset included in CBP looks at phetamines. I will look at that and send it to you.
   - **b.** *Greg Allen:* Storyboard on brown trout and methamphetamines in the Bay is something we could consider.
   - **c.** Action Items Updates:
     - i. Ag watersheds story map is under review but not final yet.
     - ii. Once STAC Workshop is underway will solidify contacts at EPA
     - iii. Still working on going before AgWG at some point. First, we will meet with our contacts- Leon Tillman, Ruth, and Loretta- to solidify next steps.
   - d. Other Announcements: none at this time
2. **STAR Microplastics Science Strategy Briefing**
   - a. Discussion:
     - *i. Scott Phillips:* After you receive comments, what are your next steps?
     - *ii. Matt Robinson:* We are briefing the MB tomorrow and then we will be refining the science strategy as well as implementing it in the next year. There is some buzz that some states will make this a priority or that there could be an executive council directive but that's still up in the air.
     - *iii. Greg Allen:* we were curious if toxic contaminants were connecting to the plastics and when ingested there is exposure to those contaminants. Did the effort so far consider if the plasticizers ran through the digestive system are they showing up in the tissues?
     - *iv. Matt Robinson:* the first of iteration of this ERA didn't look at that but it's a future research concern.

v. *Greg Allen:* ok, so it seems like there are two big questions: what is absorbed through the plastic and whether plastics breakdown themselves.
vi. *Matt Robinson:* there is some research indicating that plastics are being absorbed, but whether that's from the food or the fact that food was wrapped in plastic, is hard to determine.
vii. *Greg Allen:* I think the report makes some important contributions to moving this issue forward. For example, we settled on 5mm as the starting size for Microplastics.
viii. *Matt Robinson:* yea that is a huge point of contention at the STAC workshop, but we settled on 5mm. Nano- plastics have huge implications because they can go through cellular membranes which has huge ecological implications.

3. STAR Coordination for Integrated Monitoring Networks

a. Discussion:

i. *Dave Whitall:* some of these contaminant classes are hydrophilic which means that you must monitor water or tissue, but if you have to monitor water, that's a whole different type of monitoring (there's a big difference between monitoring for PCBs and pharmaceuticals).
ii. *Emily Majcher:* I think that is a good point and something to be mindful of when defining objectives.
iii. *Greg Allen:* for PCBs, an important question is how can monitoring help us with this issue.
iv. *George Onyullo:* it's a little surprising to me the position of mercury with toxic contaminants of emerging concerns (referring to Mentimeter ranking of monitoring priorities). I think what's reflective here is: what people want to see instead of what is readily available to inform management action. I will take PFAS as an example: there are a lot of challenges with monitoring PFAS as we know. I think we need to consider what needs to be done and what we can practically do. I also looked at Emily's presentation, and I have in mind two things: You indicated that the data we have is robust, and my concern is at what scale we are defining robustness? There are many cases in DC where a simple analysis of trend can be a challenge in certain respects, but if we widen the net are we talking about a trend at the base scale? Scale has to be important when we are talking about data robustness.
v. *Scott Phillips:* we want to set up anchor sites to see if change is occurring over time in areas where people are interested in reducing toxic contaminants.
vi. *Peter Tango:* I can provide an example: the SAV indicator looks at SAV as the overall health, but they recognize the layers below (fish health, water quality, etc.) and maybe that's something to consider when looking at toxic contaminants.
vii. *Len Schugam:* what level of funding would we be looking at?
viii. *Scott Phillips:* I don't have an estimate. I know that is something that is being discussed. I think we would include a rough estimate in our factsheet.
ix. *Len Schugam:* in the state of MD, we are shifting gears right now for a fish consumption advisory program and we are going to be focusing on PFAS throughout the state, because of that and level funding we may not have as much funding for PCBs and Mercury as we have in the past.
x. *George Onyullo:* one of the sources that the literature speaks about all the time is wastewater treatment plants. However, the data has to be there to support that, and accompanying that is the level of contaminant from that source.
xi. **Action:** TCW will continue to refine the proposed monitoring objectives utilizing the information provided on the Jamboard.

Call Participants
Hilary Swartwood, CRC

This meeting is recorded for internal use to ensure the accuracy of the meeting minutes

Matt Robinson, MDR
Bob Murphy, Tetra Tech
Breck Sullivan, CRC
Doug Austin, SEE EPA
Dave Whitall, NOAA
Emily Majcher, USGS
George Onyullo, DOEE
Greg Allen, EPA
Kelly Smalling, USGS
Kelly Somers, EPA
Len Schugam, MDE
Leon Tillman, NRCS
Marel King, CRC
Peter Tango, USGS
Scott Phillips, USGS
Vicki Blazer, USGS
Mark Richards, VA DEQ
Lorie Baker, EPA
Barnett Rattner, USGS