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, August 11, 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 • Welcome Stream Health WG Leadership to TCW • WQGIT updated their Governance Protocols • Preliminary GIT Funding Project Proposals due to TCW by *August 23rd*; final proposals due by *September 22nd* • The action group for the STAC PFAS Workshop will have their first planning meeting this month! • California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) released a draft technical support document detailing proposed Public Health Goals for PFOA (0.007 ppt) and PFOS (1 ppt) in drinking water. *Link to article here.* • Special edition of Integrated Environmental Assessment and Monitoring focused on PFAS and Ecological Risk assessment recently published. *Link to journal here.*		• 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. Overview on Stressors Effecting Stream Health - Rosemary Fanelli, USGS • Overview of the current project, with a focus on toxic contaminants, as one of the stressors to stream health	1:15	• Presentation

• Update on next steps: Stream Health WG GIT funded projects on BMPs to reduce stressors (Alisona Santoro, MDE)
• Feedback from TCW on:
  ○ Does the TCW have any suggestions for how toxic contaminants are being addressed as a stressor in the stream health project
  ○ Are there opportunities for TCW involvement and collaboration in the Stream heath WG project on BMPs?		

3. Next steps for toxic contaminant monitoring for STAR Effort - Emily Majcher and Scott Phillips, USGS • Present results from TCW input on toxic contaminant monitoring needs and objectives (Scott Phillips) see discussion paper. • Discuss refining objectives for toxic contaminants monitoring: addressing items named in the research outcome (PCBs, Mercury, other contaminants of widespread and emerging concern) (Scott Phillips, USGS). Items include: i. Are these potential indicators the TCW wants to consider aligning with the monitoring objectives (Scott Phillips and Emily Majcher, USGS) • Next steps: design considerations	2:00	• Discussion paper for toxic contaminants monitoring. • Jamboard for refining objectives, alignment with potential indicators, and design considerations.
4. Wrap Up and Adjourn	3:00	• ***Next meeting:* Wednesday, September 8, 2021**

1. **Introduction and Announcements**
   a. **Action:** TCW members should submit GIT Funding Project proposal ideas to TCW leadership by August 23rd.
2. **Overview on Stressors Effecting Stream Health**
   a. Overview of the current project, with a focus on toxic contaminants, as one of the stressors to stream health
      i. Discussion:
         1. *Dave Montali:* If you look to WV's TMDL you will probably find that it's sedimentation for those blue impaired segments.
         2. *Rosemary Fanelli:* this is a first step in figuring out what we need to quantify this issue.
         3. *Mindy Neil:* we just became aware of this being a reporting issue and we do have plans to go back in and update ATTAINS.
         4. *Mark Richardson:* It's a very similar situation in VA. Our water quality folks are in talks with EPA to see how we resolve it in ATTAINS. It's not the actual cause of the benthic problem, and by and large we do see a lot of sedimentation and nutrient issues that are problematic to the benthic issue.
         5. *Raffi Marano:* What are the next steps for this research? Other folks that I work with would be interested in hearing about this as well.
         6. *Rosemary Fanelli:* I would love to brief other groups and it would be good to talk offline. We are wrapping up a draft report and we will be doing some outreach to get these results out.

7. *Len Schugam:* In these toxic impairments, I am assuming that chlorides and ions are not associated in the toxic impairment, but is there consideration to include it?
8. *Rosemary Fanelli:* it is being considered by EPA but right now they are separate in ATTAINS.
9. *Len Schugam:* The literature also addresses the BIBI issue as well?
10. *Rosemary Fanelli:* the analysis focuses mostly on benthic, but we also have a section on other response variables. The ecological end member could change the results. It's up to the managers to find the best way to define stream health. Some of the recent USGS stressor research looks at biological end members (all three members, algae, fish, and benthic).
11. *Len Schugam:* were most of these correlated analyses?
12. *Rosemary Fanelli:* yes, that is correct.
13. *Len Schugam:* one thing that has come up for MD is doing more of a toxicity screening at some of the monitoring stations. Has this come up?
14. *Rosemary Fanelli:* yes, this did come up, especially where there was a known source like a wastewater treatment plant. I think it was Moran, 2020. I can send you a few papers if you are interested.

b. Update on next steps: Stream Health WG GIT funded projects on BMPs to reduce stressors (Alisona Santoro, MDE)
   i. Discussion:
      1. *Scott Phillips:* is there any one from TCW on your technical advisory committee?
      2. *Alison Santoro:* I would need to look back. If there is a way to pull out the most important contaminants that would be helpful. Are their contaminants that you would like us to focus on more than others?
      3. *Scott Phillips:* some of the contaminants that are of importance: PCBs is one of the most important, mercury is behind that (both contribute to fish advisories), behind that is contaminants of widespread concern, mostly focusing on pesticides.
      4. *Greg Allen:* I think a good follow up question is how many you think you could handle? For example, PAHs are another impact to benthic, specifically in urban areas.
      5. *Alison Santoro:* I think we are going for a shorter list because we are trying to be able to break it down
      6. *Claire Buchanan:* are you going to GIS metrics, because I think that could have a lot of potential?
      7. *Neely Law:* the scope of this group of studies are overall goal was to back up with science to deliver a communication tool to better understand what we know and don't know about stream health. As we approach the 2025 TMDL there is a lot of research on how our streams are responding to these extensive management. WE want to have information on what the gaps are and use this to figure out how we move forward past 2025. The stressors that the CWP is really leading off the grouping of stressors of the USGS work so it's more categorical and there are data limitations with a stressor and its impact to BMPs. It would be helpful to have TCW member present at the next meeting.
      8. *Scott Phillips:* if there are items in the short term that would- ex, which contaminant groups we should submit or which you have already identified. Longer term, it would be helpful to get the results of this project so we can work more closely on the next phase of this project.
      9. *Greg Allen:* we also do some of the same mapping that the SHWG is doing. It would an opportunity to form a better portfolio of maps that are telling the same story for contaminants.
      10. *Alison Santoro:* To Claire's question, we are far away from being able to decide on metrics. This is to be determined in the next year/ two years.

c. Feedback from TCW on:
   i. Does the TCW have any suggestions for how toxic contaminants are being addressed as a stressor in the stream health project?
      1. Discussion**: (see above)**
   ii. Are there opportunities for TCW involvement and collaboration in the Stream heath WG project on BMPs?

d. Discussion from Webex Chat:
   i. *Scott Phillips:* Question for end of presentation: were PCBs mentioned in the studies you reviewed for toxic contaminant stressor?
   ii. *Dave Montali:* I have lots of questions (WV) cause unknown, toxics, acidity. Will wait till end of presentation
   iii. *Raffi Marano:* Thank you for your presentation! What are the next steps for this research? I'm involved in the 303(d) listing program at EPA and folks I work with would definitely be interested in hearing this presentation. My email is marano.raffaela@epa.gov
   iv. *Emily Majcher:* Rosemary, our TCW has included salinity/chloride in emerging issues in our Research LAP
   v. *Emily Majcher:* Do the preliminary stressors identified in USGS study correspond to focus on GIT project?
   vi. *Claire Buchanan:* The delay in analyzing the biological (macroinvertebrate) data is the fact that they are often collected on a rotational basis in most states. What are the types of data being considered for these new metrics and are they collected on a more frequent (e.g., yearly) basis?
   vii. *Emily Majcher:* It would be helpful to understand which toxic contaminants if any are identified by the GIT group as important for stream health - and for us to cross-walk which ones also overlap with TCW priorities

3. Next steps for toxic contaminant monitoring for STAR Effort

a. *Fred Pinkney:* I don't have a problem with any of this, it's important to be aware that there is an extensive quantitative cost to this. It's a worthy goal, but we need to be aware that it's costly to do this in more than one river system.
b. *Greg Allen:* we know we won't have a bay wide monitoring program, far too expensive, but we do want to know is there complimentary monitoring that can be done outside of what's already being done by jurisdictions.
c. *John Cargill:* ideally, DE would sample SW heads of tide in major tributaries over time.
d. *Fred Pinkney:* in an ideal world all states would use the same methods for fish sampling. That could be something the Bay program could facilitate.
e. *Greg Allen:* initially we didn't think we could standardize methods, but it's good to have on our radar. If we were to go forward with consistent PCB monitoring.
f. *Greg Allen:* we heard about microplastics from the PPAT team, there could be monitoring objective from that to tune into from that report. For PFAS, we have a major effort coming up over the next few months, is there any way to keep a place holder there to say after that workshop we may have a better idea on what needs there are.
g. *Scott Phillips:* this objective's focus is on status, and we want to make sure that every is okay with this.
h. *Fred Pinkney:* I would add fish and shellfish
i. *Scott Phillips:* we aren't doing drinking water because MB said that was already being addressed.
j. *Dave Montali:* it might be more efficient to track where drinking water is being used you could use that information to help with this tracking effort.
k. *John Cargill:* I sit on another committee and most jurisdictions are focused on drinking water first, although there are more activities related to surface water and fish. Not every state is in the same place. We don't have standards yet for this so it's hard to compare.
l. *Scott Phillips:* we definitely want to tag into that working group as we start the PFAS workshop.

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

4. Wrap up and Adjourn

Call Participants
Dave Whitall, NOAA
Scott Phillips, USGS
Emily Majcher, USGS
Vicki Blazer, USGS
Rosemary Fanelli, USGS
Alison Santoro, MDE
Greg Allen, EPA
Doug Austin, SEE
Len Schugam, MDE
Steve Hummel, VA DEQ
George Onyullo, DOEE
Matt Kundrat, PA DEP
Rebecca Whiteash, PA DEP
John Cargill, DNREC
Claire Buchanan, ICPRB
Rikke Jepsen, ICPRB
Jamie Shallenberger, SRBC
Raffaela Marano, EPA
Mark Richards, VA DEQ
Tom Parham, MDNR
Kelly Smalling, USGS
Katlyn Fuentes, CRC
Fred Pinkney, USFWS
Dave Montali, Tetra Tech
Rob Breeding, VA DEQ
Justin Shapiro, CRC
Brittany Flaten, DNREC
Mindy Neil, WV DEP
Neely Law, CWP

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