THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

CBP Water Quality Goal Implementation Team
Toxic Contaminants Workgroup
Meeting Agenda

Date: *Wednesday, October 13, 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 • Researchers from Texas A&M, Brown University, and UC San Diego SRP Centers developed an online interactive dashboard called the Toxics Mobility Vulnerability Index (TMVI). "Their objective is to display how land use, such as green space or industrial land, interacts with extreme weather and sociodemographic characteristics to affect public health." (NIH, SRP Science Digest) – Emily Majcher, USGS • Update on STAC PFAS Workshop planning and forthcoming inventory request • Webinar recording of Human and Ecological Effects of Microplastics: Report-out of Key Findings (Southern California Coastal Water Research Project Authority and SFEI) • New York releases new guidance to regulate PFOS, PFOA, and 1,4-dioxane in state waters • Policy and Prevention Outcome GIT Funding Proposal – feedback/questions • Safe and Efficient Lighting Bay Backpack for EPA Region 3 Children's Health month	1:00	• TCW Members will submit info on ongoing/ planned PCB monitoring efforts • TCW will create a 2- page monitoring factsheet for STAR • Complete the toxic contaminant indicator • Update the PCB Story Map • 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.

2. PCB Monitoring Discussion Paper – Scott Phillips and Emily Majcher, USGS Review the responses to inventory of PCB monitoring. Have discussion of gaps and recommendations for opportunities to enhance monitoring that was requested by PSC.	1:15	• Presentation/discussion • Inventory Overview • Updated draft of monitoring paper for toxic contaminants.
3. Pooled Monitoring Initiative – PCBs – Sadie Drescher, Chesapeake Bay Trust	2:15	
4. Wrap Up and Adjourn	2:45	• ***Next meeting:* Wednesday, November 10, 2021**

Summary of Actions and Decisions

Action: TCW leadership will reach out to NY to schedule a presentation on how they came up with their criteria for regulating PFAS

Meeting Minutes

1. **Intro and Announcements**
    a. TMVI: TCW leadership will be meeting with the researchers to discuss the implications for the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. This could be something brought to the group at a later meeting.
    b. PFAS STAC Workshop: there will be an inventory request/ questionnaire. The chairs will be coming to this meeting in November to discuss the ask and provide more information.
    c. NYS release of PFAS regulation guidance includes drinking water and aquatic life. Request from John Cargill (DNREC) to have NY come to TCW to discuss the development of their criteria for PFAS regulations.
        i. **Action:** TCW leadership will reach out to NY to schedule a presentation on how they came up with their criteria for regulating PFAS
2. **PCB Monitoring Discussion Paper**
    a. *George Onyullo:* with respect to slide 6, because we have existing TMDLS, sources of PCB have been identified. However, there are some sources that were previously not identified. I think we should be specific and say identified previously and known sources.
    b. *Dave Whitall:* looking at surface water, if you are talking about loads you need that flow # nailed down, but the other issues is that the surface numbers can change quite quickly. The timing of surface water and the number of surface water samples you need to take becomes a large to get a handle on the temporal variability. I wouldn't want to necessarily hang my hat on surface water samples. While I like the idea of doing fish, I wonder if other mediums have been considered, like bivalves and sediment.
    c. *Len Schugam:* In response of what David just said. You could still do passive sampling on surface water and there can some integration in terms of storm events as well. I agree with other media, but one question is in terms of where would be monitoring? The listing basis is usually consumable fish within the estuary. For example, let's say one site is remediate in lower beaver dam creek, where would we want to characterize? We may not see anything significant statistically, or if you are looking at the outflow of the creek you could look at forage fish.

If the endpoint is consumable fish in the estuary, it is going to take time. I know in MD we are not at that stage we haven't done a lot of mitigation outside of what's already been done and sometimes you still see natural attenuation of fish in those systems.

d. *Scott Phillips:* I think your first point of where to put the site- you can't put a site way out in the estuary, and this would allow us to place additional site(s) at those points.
e. *Emily Majcher:* we certainly are aware that the jurisdictions are taking an assessment of mitigation actions. The Lower beaver dam creek example, we don't want to repeat/ duplicate what you are already verifying in your actions. The idea would be that we go far enough downstream where you may have the lower beaver dam action and then the interim rod actions and then there may be other actions that we would start seeing a collective impact to eventually see a reduction.
f. *Len Schugam:* in that case does that mean it goes back to a response of the system?
g. *Emily Majcher:* I think it would potentially vary depending on what we as a group decide are criteria for a site. Would we be targeting areas with the highest load or potential actions planned in that area? I don't think we need to limit it; we could tailor the sampling to the area. Maybe that leaves it more ambiguous to be defined by those locations as opposed to having them all be the same conditions.
h. *George Onyullo:* I am supporting the point that Emily made. The reason I agree with Emily, different jurisdictions have different needs that drive their data selection. More importantly, one point Dave made with respect to surface water, often flow is missing. But I think we are at a point where flow is not going to be a constraint. Monitoring in different multiple media; at a local level we get a sense how PCBS play out in the media we select. I think our challenge here is to look at things at scale.
i. *Emily Majcher:* those are all good points. I would just bring up that one gap we identified is that we don't have consistency across jurisdictions and one of the intents of this effort would be to build a data set that would be consistent across space and time. Maybe that's not as critical as we talk about this geographically focused area. I think what I hear people saying is that having some ambiguity in here is okay if we explain why.
j. *Dave Whitall:* having statistical power is better. I think the problem you can run into that you are either going to need a long period of time or a tremendous number of samples to get an idea of what is going. I think we need to be cognizant of the question we are asking at the end of the day. It's important to be aware of the variability and how it impacts your results over time.
k. *George Onyullo:* I think we need to define exactly what we want to do with an analysis of an outcome based on near and long- term needs. Near term needs address what management we want to see because they aren't bothered with long-term trends. The data can be looked at in the near-term or long- term.
l. *George Onyullo:* I know how tightly our frequency is determined. That is tightly tied to what the monitoring group has agreed to with EPA. One way to base line the frequency of collection is to look at what monitoring, and assessment branches do, but we can occasionally tell them that there are guts here can you bring that in with opportunistic sampling. We realize that fish sampling is the most consistent, but how can we improve upon that? We can do that by saying that from time to time there is need to do other monitoring to get more information than what you would get from fish sampling.
m. *Len Schugam:* in this proposal are you going to propose a timeframe for this monitoring?
n. *Scott Phillips:* we weren't trying to address the whole bay watershed, instead we were trying to focus on places (ex. Anacostia) and what you would do in a place and that's where the frequency comes in to play- how long do you think you would need to monitor to get to a predetermined endpoint?
o. *Len Schugam:* that's the million-dollar question.

3. Pooled Monitoring Initiative

a. **Link to the website: https://cbtrust.org/grants/restoration-research/**
b. *Emily Majcher:* just so you know one of our main focuses is PCBs, but another focus is CECs and road salt is included in that group. It's great to know that there is work going on in that area.
c. *Sadie Drescher:* I would love to stay connected to this group so that we can share information.
d. *Emily Majcher:* is it open to all partner states?
e. *Sadie Drescher:* we are open to other jurisdictions and have had projects in VA etc.

4. **Wrap Up and Adjourn**

Call Participants

Scott Phillips, USGS
Emily Majcher, USGS
Hilary Swartwood, CRC
Doug Austin, SEE- EPA
Sadie Drescher, CBT
John Cargill, DNREC
Dave Whitall, NOAA
George Onyullo, DOEE
Len Schugam, MDE
Lisa Ochsenhirt, AquaLaw
Marel King, CBC
Mark Richards, VA DEQ
Matt Kundrat, PA DEP
Steve Hummel, VA DEQ
Vicki Blazer, USGS