



CBP Water Quality Goal Implementation Team

Toxic Contaminants Workgroup

May 18, 2017

Calendar: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/25048/>

Meeting Minutes

Summary of Actions and Decisions

- **Action:** Greg Allen, Michelle Williams and Laura Free will continue review of the toxics indicator map with MDE and bring the issue before the workgroup again in June.
- **Action:** Draft artwork for the fish consumption advisory infographic will be sent out to the workgroup for comment and feedback at the June TCW conference call.
- **Action:** Review thoroughly the DRBC document and come up with a mock outline as a direction to build out.

Welcome, introductions, relevant news and announcements

Upcoming Workshop on Climate Change and Toxic Contaminants Adaptive management approaches

Announcements:

- CR Workgroup—workshop on climate adaptation in Toxics Management—May 31 will be first SC meeting.
- BMP Co-Benefits Scoring Report—final draft is finished, briefing at [June 12 WQGIT meeting](#)—Michelle will send out a reminder to workgroup.

Discussion on Representing 2014 Toxic Impairments Map

In April, several TCW members met with MDE representatives to discuss options for representing toxic impairments in MD tidal Bay segments which had small partial impairments covering only small parts of tidal segments. The TCW will hear outcomes from the April discussion and talk about steps needed to finalize the indicator.

Discussion:

- The lag time is quite long, so 2014 indicator data is currently being finalized from state integrated reports, 2016 integrated reports won't be available for about another year. There is a [document](#) on Chesapeakebay.net's indicators page that records some of the methods used for mapping these impairments. The importance of keeping consistent rules from previous indicator assessments was noted, but over-representing reported impairments is also a concern.
- Greg Allen suggested that for the quantitative measure, one option would be continuing to count small overlaps as impaired segments, but directly representing un-aggregated state reported data for mapping purposes. Benefit of this approach is that it stays consistent with 2012 indicator representation.

- We may want to consider some threshold if a cut-off for counting tidal segments as impaired.
- So then, what is the states' maps that we would assemble?
 - It was noted that MD's PCB maps have dual-scale representation—specific boundaries of monitoring at small scale, and aggregated to 8-digit watersheds at large scale
- Len Schugam: I'd like to just show the reported extent, and not aggregate to larger areas.
- Greg Allen: Mark, is there something analogous to this for VA?
 - Mark Richards: What's been captured in the tidal areas already is what we've got for VA, we don't have any conflicting data for the map.
- Greg Allen: So that should be OK for representing on the map, then what about the quantitative indicator?
 - Len Schugam: Those small areas would actually be dropped out of the 303(d) listing process, so their listing would change. A TMDL would not actually address those small areas of shoreline. For instance, at the Tangier Sound area. In Maryland, the 8-digit basins and the tidal bay segments don't always match up, so some TMDLs wouldn't address those areas.
 - Greg Allen: So these tidal segments don't actually have enough coverage to determine impairments then?
 - Len Schugam: that's correct.
- Greg Allen: Is Herring Bay is the only new impaired area listed between 2012 and 2014?
 - Len Schugam: Correct, and Herring Bay is part of that larger tidal segment, so that could be aggregated. Also, those impairment areas are always subject to change; we might have something different to report in future years.
- Scott Phillips: One issue might be conceptual matching between quantitative indicators and the actual map extent, if we say that 85% of the bay segments have full or partial impairments, but the map seems to show far less than 85%, that could be a problem.
- Laura Free: We do use surface area in the Water Quality Standards indicator to quantify WQ for segments. If we want to transition to account of the segments to percentage of the surface area in the Bay, that might be an option to consider.
- Greg Allen: Our goal is to use the TMDL and the CWA to reduce the amount of impairments out there, so our indicator should track TMDL development
- Laura: Do we want surface area for Bay segments or surface area for state monitoring? In the latter case, we'd need to put out another data call to MD and VA. The areas on the map right now are representations of state monitoring areas.
 - Greg Allen: This could be another option to consider.
 - Laura Free: We should also ask MD if they have any data or files that match up state monitoring areas with surface areas impaired.
 - Len Schugam: Surface area of the impaired areas is included with the shapefile, so that information is out there. Going back to partial impairments, I think Herring Bay is the only true partial overlay that would aggregate up to a Bay segment, and the rest, like the Tangier Sound can be cut back so as to not overlay with tidal segments. It might be a case-by-case-basis type of thing.
 - Greg Allen: Ok, so maybe we'll just have to work with you some more, Len and go through these issues on a case-by-case basis.

- Greg Allen: If we count areas like Herring Bay as a partial overlay, we would still map it just as the extent MD has reported even though we list the tidal segment as impaired.
 - Laura Free: Would that tidal segment be counted in the percentage of segments impaired? And then, what about the areas hugging the shoreline, vs things like Herring Bay that's a new substantial embayment that's impaired, vs a more minor embayment
 - Scott Phillips: These aren't documented decisions in the methods that are already there for previous indicators?
 - Greg Allen: I'd need to go back and look at that record in detail.
- Greg Allen: I'm not sure what risk we want to be more careful of avoiding here— we have to walk the line between saying it is when it isn't vs saying it isn't when it is.
 - Laura Free: I don't have a strong preference, but the biggest concern I have is reproducing that methodology and decision-making for further indicator development.
 - Greg: I hope that our indicator representation is sensitive enough to actually show new listings for 2012 vs 2014.
 - Len: There are 8 new listings in 2014 vs 2012
 - Greg: So we need to figure out a way to accurately represent those other new listings aside from Herring Bay.
- Greg: We need some more time to come to a good solution for representing this impairments indicator right now. I think the next step is to go through these areas with Len on the phone.

Action: Greg Allen, Michelle Williams, and Laura Free will continue review of the toxics indicator map with MDE and bring the issue before the workgroup again in June.

Updates on TCW Projects

- Fish Consumption Advisory Project
 - Work on fish consumption advisories is in the workplan for PCBs as an awareness builder, and TCW has partnered with the Diversity Workgroup on this project to target underserved communities.
 - This project has three potential products. 3 products we're moving toward. First, an infographic with pictures, minimal words, that easily conveys the message. #2 is an animated whiteboard story with an artist drawing images and a narrator conveying information on PCBs in fish and consumption advisories. The third product is a more detailed fact sheet, likely a two-pager. We are working with Tetra Tech to develop the first infographic product. The animated video will probably exceed capacity with Tetra Tech, so we are reaching out to our creative team to see if we can do it in-house. There may be future opportunities for goal team funding later as well. Tetra Tech may or may not be able to do the two-pager.
 - We have received a preliminary mock-up of infographic, sent back comments, and should receive a more finalized draft soon. We should be able to provide that art and get feedback from the workgroup at our June meeting.

Action: Draft artwork for the fish consumption advisory infographic will be sent out to the workgroup for comment and feedback at the June TCW conference call.

- Climate Change Workshop Steering Committee—first meeting scheduled May 31

- Zoe Johnson: In March, I presented an overview of the climate resiliency analysis project. We've done this workshop with SAV and Black duck workgroups, and we're ready to run it with Toxics now. We have an ongoing list of steering committee members, and if anyone on the call is interested in joining the SC, let us know on the call. Folks already on the SC should have received a calendar invite for May 31.
- The workshop will take place later this summer. A range of dates will be sent out in June to gauge workgroup availability for the in-person workshop.
- PCB Trackdown Study Guidance and PMP guidance development
 - Our strategy and workplan contain goal around PCB TMDLs. We thought we could develop a CB-wide PMP guidance, and trackdown study guidance as a tie-in to PMP guidance.
 - For PMP: We had decided to wait for VA to produce a PMP guidance, and for trackdown, we first worked with TT and got mainly a literature review. We also worked with DNREC and DRBC, and they gave us some material that would help move forward on PMP guidance.
 - We have to make decisions on whether this is still a needed product and next steps for trackdown and PMP document.

Workgroup call formally adjourned, PCB work session continued.

Following adjournment of the workgroup meeting, we ask any interested members to join in discussing next steps and options for continuing work on a document(s) for PCB trackdown studies and PMP guidance. A partially-finished TetraTech document was reviewed in May 2016, and some documents were provided by DNREC and DRBC as models for a document specific to the Chesapeake Bay watershed. We will discuss the work still to be done, and whether jurisdictions consider this a useful project for the substantial commitment required.

Discussion:

- Mark Richards: The technical resource guide on the [calendar page](#) is for the whole state, and is intended to be incorporated into a larger PMP guidance for VA. There are two tables that go with this guide. [Remediation technologies for sources of contamination](#) is one table, and another table shows [remediation technology cost and effectiveness](#).
- Greg Allen: Had you still been focusing on developing some larger PMP guidance?
 - Mark Richards: Right, we had been working on this. From a DEQ staffing perspective, we're looking for ways to allow our staff to review developed PMPs.
- Greg Allen: To clarify, any guidance we develop would need to have state-specific elements to it. And there's currently no analogous statewide guidance in MD.
 - Len Schugam: We don't have a state-wide guidance, even though we do have individual TMDL plans under MS4, but we have no way of reviewing or providing guidance on that.
- Greg Allen: So it seems like there still is a need for this, but it's up to MD and VA to shape where this goes.
- Mark Richards: From VA, I almost have to do that internally and incorporate regional office input, and have some kind of planning or review team. I'm not sure I can really count on CBP to provide guidance for VA, we might have to do this on our own. For instance, I tried to follow some DRBC guidance for point sources, but I had to heavily adapt it for applicability in VA.

- Greg Allen: First of all, we need to consider how we could incorporate state-specific info as modules into a larger document, or maybe it doesn't make sense to have an umbrella document if state needs are so varied. We need to decide whether to knit state-specific elements into a larger guide, or whether everyone should stick with separate guidances. The other issue to address is how can we help you to move the development of this project forward?
 - Mark Richards: My roadblock is time. I just haven't had enough time to move this forward.
- Scott Phillips: A third option might be for each state to adopt common elements that we can all agree are needed in a guidance, and then states can take that framework and adapt it for jurisdictional needs.
 - Len Schugam: We just need a general guidance that jurisdictions can take as a resource to create PMPs within each state. Scott's suggestion would certainly work for us.
 - Scott Phillips: So we don't develop an overall guidance, we just develop an outline of approaches and methodologies. If we can't find funds to help you, we can at least give you some resources.
- Len Schugam: Has DRBC had success in reducing PCBs in their MS4 jurisdictions?
- Greg Allen: We got some good overviews of PMP stuff from DRBC, but we don't have specific information on MS4 jurisdictions.
- Mark Richards: I can give you the status from VA: We have MS4 jurisdictions that are developing PMPs, they come to me for review, and then they get implemented and submit annual reports, but there's no general guidance to standardize those PMPs. I want to give something to our staff to take the responsibility for review off my shoulders. We need some kind of general framework to check against for doing reviews of submitted PMPs. We're not asking anyone to do trackdown yet, but it's coming down the pipe. There's a flood of trackdown and PMP work coming down the pipeline.
- Greg Allen: What's your supervisor situation?
 - Mark: Julie Sneider is the supervisor for this now.
- Greg Allen: It sounds like you have a huge need here for some assistance, and in some way, CBP should be able to help. Whether its contract work, or in-person work sessions or workshops that we can help or facilitate, we'd really like to be able to help.
 - Mark Richards: I wish I had a good response for you, I appreciate it, but I'm not sure what you can do to help.
 - Greg Allen: Well, think about it, maybe we can facilitate an in-person workshop or something. If we have some time we can think of something creative to get the ball rolling. In the meantime, we can keep working through the TetraTech document, Scott maybe can work with MD and VA to identify common elements for a resource document.
- Greg Allen: The objective I had was to give an overview and determine whether there is still a need for this item. It seems like we covered both those objectives today. We didn't get as far as we hoped on either trackdown or PMP with the last effort that Tetra Tech made, so we need to push through and get this to a point that it's useful. We'll have to see if any ideas pop up.
 - Mark: I will keep that in mind.
- Greg Allen: Maybe late summer or something we could find a time to all sit down together for 2 or 3 days. Next calendar year, we will need to do SRS with MB, so we've got to communicate

PCB and PMP progress in our workplan and strategy. So we should have something substantive to report to the Management Board when the time comes.

Action: review thoroughly the DRBC document and come up with a mock outline as a direction to build out.

Our next meeting will be moved to June 21 instead of our regular meeting date. Workgroup members are encouraged to let us know if they have any agenda items to include on the June agenda.

Participants:

Greg Allen
Scott Phillips
Michelle Williams
Len Schugam--MDE
Mark Richards—VA DEQ
Laura Free
Micka Peck
Amy Williams—PA DEP
Zoe Johnson
Marel King, CBC